Remind-Me Presuppositions and Speech-Act Decomposition:
Japanese *kke* and German *wieder*

Uli Sauerland and Kazuko Yatsushiro

ZAS Berlin

uli@alum.mit.edu, kazuko@me.com

January 2014

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate questions like 'What is your name again?'. The question presupposes that the answer was already made common-ground knowledge in the past (Sauerland 1999, Snippets). We call this a *remind-me* presupposition. While in German and English the repetitive particles can trigger a remind-me presupposition, Japanese has a specialized particle *kke* to bring about a remind-me presupposition. We argue for an account of remind-me presuppositions based on syntactic decomposition of the question speech-act into an imperative part and a part meaning make-it-known. On this account, the two particles take scope between the two parts of the decomposed question speech-act. We show that the proposal predicts correctly that both particles must interact syntactically with the periphery of the clause in specific, slightly different ways. This interaction corroborates our proposal that the decomposed

1

question speech-act parts are syntactically projected parts of the question structure. Our data therefore has general implications for speech act theory.

1   Introduction

The starting point of this paper is the following observation (Sauerland, 2009):

(1)   Wie ist wieder Ihr   Name? (GERMAN)
      how is again   your name

      'What is your name again?'

The question in (1) and also its English translation have a special meaning that we can initially paraphrase as follows: 'I used to know your name, but forgot. Could you remind me what your name is?' The presupposition that your name was known in the past is triggered by the repetitive particles *wieder* ('again') in German and *again* in the English translation. When the particles are omitted this presupposition isn't present. In this paper, we use the descriptive label *remind-me presupposition* for a presupposition of prior knowledge of the answer. For English and German, we saw in (1) and its translation that the remind-me reading of a question can be enforced by the focus particles *again* and *wieder* ('again'). In German, furthermore the focus particle *noch mal* ('again', lit. 'another time') can serve the same function as in (2), and is in fact preferred by many speakers.

(2)   Wie ist noch mal Ihr   Name? (GERMAN)
      how is again   your name

      'What is your name again?'

One interesting property of remind-me presuppositions in German and English is that the focus particles *wieder* and *again* can only trigger it in questions. Consider the declarative counterpart of

(1) in (3) and its English translation. (3) cannot be used in a scenario where either the statement was made known to the hearer or the common ground in the past.

(3)   Mein Name ist wieder Kai. (GERMAN)
        My   name is again Kai

        'My name is Kai again.'

Rather the presupposition triggered by *wieder* and *again* in (3) is one of event repetition predicted by the discussions of such focus particles in the semantic literature (Klein, 2001): One possible scenario where (3) is acceptable, is one with where I changed my name: Specifically, I have changed my name at least twice: My name was originally *Kai*, but then changed it to something else, and now I changed it back to *Kai*. A second scenario supporting (3) is the following: there is a salient referent of the name *Kai* in the context, who recently announced his name. So, I am the second person who is announcing that his name is Kai in the relevant context.

In questions however, *wieder/again* doesn't need to trigger either of these presuppositions, but instead can trigger the remind-me presupposition. At least the event repetition repetition is also available in questions, in which case the remind-me presupposition isn't triggered.[1] But the remind me presupposition is much more felicitous in (1) and (2).

Consider now the semantic content of the remind me presupposition: Actually, the paraphrase we just above for (3) is slightly inaccurate in that it requires that the speaker be the one who has prior knowledge of the answer. As Sauerland (2009) already points out that the presup-

---

[1]The second reading we noted for (3) is also available with *wieder/noch mal* for polar questions as in (i), and also in *wh*-questions where the *wh*-phrase doesn't relate to a position in the scope of *wieder/noch mal*.

(i)   Ist Dein Name wieder/noch mal Kai?
       Is your name again/again   Kai

       'Is your name Kai like somebody else's before?'

(ii)   Wessen Name ist wieder/noch mal Kai?
      whose name is again/again Kai

      'Whose is name is Kai like somebody else's before?'

We think that the reading is not available for (1) and (2) because there is a conflict between the presupposition that somebody else had name n before, and asking for name n.

posed prior knowledge need not be the speakers, but can just have been contributed to the common ground. Specifically, (3) is acceptable in the following scenario: At the reception, the names of all the participants are announced at the beginning. However, I make no effort to listen to the announcement. Later, I encounter you, and want you to tell me your name. In this scenario, the speaker never knew the name of the addressee, but, the name of the addressee was contributed to the common ground in the past by the announcer. The scenario shows two interesting aspect of the remind-me presupposition of (3): For one, (3) doesn't presuppose that the speaker knew the answer to the question before, but it is sufficient that the answer was contributed to the common ground in the past. And secondly, (3) doesn't presuppose that it was the addressee who contributed the answer to the common ground—in the scenario, it was the announcer. In both respects, the remind-me reading differs from the interpretation of (4), which presupposes that I asked you before, but doesn't presuppose that you or anybody else answered my earlier question.[2]

(4) Noch mal: Wie ist Ihr   Name? (GERMAN)
     Again: how is your name
     'Again: What is your name?'

Now consider remind-me presuppositions in Japanese. In Japanese, they cannot be brought about by the focus particles corresponding to English *again* shown by examples (16) and (17) in section 1 below. Instead, a remind-me presupposition is expressed by the special question particle *-kke* as shown in (5).

(5) Namae-wa nan-da-kke?   (JAPANESE)
     name-Top what-COP-KKE
     'What is your name again?'

The suffix *kke* is part of a spoken register of Japanese, and as far as we could test it is available in all dialects of Japanese: all Japanese speakers we have asked accept examples like (5) with a remind-reading. Nevertheless *kke* doesn't seem to been studied much by linguists so far. However, we

---

[2]While generally *noch mal* and *wieder* are interchangeable, (4) is actually ungrammatical with *wieder*.

found one grammatical description of *-kke* in an online grammar for learners of Japanese (`http://dev.jgram.org/pages/viewOne.php?tagE=kke`),[3] where it is written that *kke is used only in conversation. It is used when asking a question in order to confirm/affirm something.* This description and the examples presented on this site is fully consistent with our account.

Interestingly, there are differences in where remind-me readings are possible between German and Japanese.[4] Specifically, neither *wieder* ('again') nor *nochmal* ('again') can trigger a remind-me presupposition in a polar question in German as shown by (6). Rather, *noch mal/wieder* in (6) can only trigger the same presuppositions as the the declarative (3): Either (6) presupposes multiple name-change of the addressee (i.e. multiple name changes), or it presupposes that some other person just talked about had the name Kai. Unless we are in one of these unusual scenarios, (6) is an odd question.

(6) #Heißen   Sie noch mal/wieder Kai? (GERMAN)
     name.PAST you again/again   Kai?

     'Was your name again Kai?'

Japanese *kke*, however, can triger a remind-me presupposition with a polar question as shown by (7): (7) can be used in a scenario where I knew in the past whether your name is Kai, but now want to be reminded about that, but where (3) is unacceptable. Note that in the same scenario, German (6) is unacceptable.

(7) Namae-wa Kai-da-kke?   (JAPANESE)
     name-Top Kai-COP-KKE

     'Tell me again whether your name is Kai.'

The analysis we develop in our paper in the following shows that the contrast between (6) and (7) provides a new arguement for a particular analysis of the remind-me reading: An analysis involving decomposition of question speech acts involving silent, but syntactically projected

---

[3]Accessed Jan. 25, 2014

[4]As the translation in (6) shows, English has a somewhat intermediate status which we discuss further below.

speech act operators. Sauerland (2009) already suggests such an analysis for the German data. In this paper, we make the decomposition proposal more precise and provide an additional argument for the decomposition proposal on the basis of the comparison of Japanese and German.

The structure of the remainder of our paper is as follows: In the first section, we complete the overview of important properties of remind-me readings in German and Japanese. In section 2, we show how an account of remind-me readings based on speech act decomposition in the syntax explains the German and Japanese data. In the concluding section 3, we especially seek to clarify the contributions from our data to the philosophical and linguistic literature on speech acts.

2   Empirical Overview

In this section, we present an overview of five empirical properties of the remind-me reading that guide our analysis in the subsequent section. Our exposition is structured in three subsections. The first subsection, concerns the nature of the triggering particle, i.e. *noch mal* vs. *kke* as already mentioned, and the role of tense. In subsection 2, we discuss the availability of remind-me interpretations in different clause types, i.e. the restriction to questions and the cross-linguistic variation in polar questions. And in the third subsection, we discuss further the position of the particle triggering the remind-me reading.

Triggering Particles and Tense

In the three languages we have looked at in detail—German, Japanese, and English—the remind-me presupposition can be triggered by the particles *wieder/noch mal*, *again*, and *kke* respectively as already shown in the introduction. In addition, questions with a remind-me presupposition generally can almost interchangeably contain either past or present tense.[5] The examples, presented in the introduction contained present tense throughout. But, if we replace the present tense with past

---

[5]ref to Hollebrandse

tense in all of them the reading remains unchanged: (8a) is a past tense counterpart of (2), and (8b) shows the past tense counterpart of (5).

(8) a. Wie war noch mal Ihr   Name? (GERMAN)
         how was again   your name
         'What was your name again?'

     b. Namae-wa nan-da-ta-kke?   (JAPANESE)
         name-Top what-COP-PAST-KKE
         'What was your name again?'

In fact, in the give scenario past tense alone is sufficient to trigger a remind-me reading. Consider the English example in (9). (9) would be odd in a scenario where it is clear that your name wasn't ever before contributed to the common ground—e.g. when I just encountered you for the first time.[6]

(9) What was your name?

Past tense in (9) and the particles in (1), (2), and (5) are therefore two independent mechanisms, that work in congruence in (8): both trigger the remind-me reading, and therefore there is no conflict. But, there is also no conflict if only one of the triggers is present: The remind-me presupposition is always added to the regular question meaning, which isn't incompatible with the remind-me presupposition. In fact, even if I knew your name in that past already, I may ask you (10).

(10) What is your name?

One difference between past tense and the particles is that past tense can actually be used in the answer to a past remind-me question, while the particles cannot occur in the answers, as dialog (11) illustrates.

---

[6]It seems possible to us to use (9) after a long conversation with a stranger even when the stranger's name wasn't mentioned before. We propose, however, that this constitutes a polite pretense that the name might have already been mentioned.

(11)   A: What was you name (again)?

        B: My name was Kai (#again).

We agree with [hollebrandse] that past tense is possible in remind-me scenarios because a past interval is salient—namely, for (9) and (11) that during which the name was previously announced. (Musan, 1997) argues that, while temporal predication generally requires interval maximization, this can be suspended when a particular interval is salient. Specifically, Musan makes use of this mechanism to explain the fact in (12): Usually the past tense of an individual-level predicate indicate that the subject is dead. But in (12), the individual-level predicates doesn't give rise to such a so-called life-time effect. Musan relates this to the fact that the first sentence makes a particular past interval salient.

(12)   I had a chance to have a closer look at him. Gregory had blue eyes. (Musan, 1997, p. 272)

The mechanism triggering remind-me readings with *again* and other particles, though, we think is a different one from past tense. Evidence for a difference between the two types of triggers comes from the data in (13) in the following scenario: A few minutes before midnight, you tell me what current date it is. Then the clock strikes midnight and, on the new day, I ask you the following:

(13)   a.   #What is the date again?

        b.   What was the date again?

In this scenario, the tense actually makes a difference as indicated: The remind-me presupposition triggered by *again* with the present tense in (13a) isn't satisfied, because the new date hasn't been mentioned before. But past tense in (13b) is fine, and could be answered for example by *The date was December 31st when I told you earlier, but now it's January 1st.* The effect of tense is expected if the past tense in (13b) indicates that the sentence is about an interval in the past—namely, that

of the earlier date announcement—, while (13b) is about the present time. The oddness of (13a) shows also that the particles trigger remind-me readings in a different way from past tense.

Now consider the particles triggering a remind-me presupposition in more detail. In English and German, they are the same particles that can also trigger a repetitive presupposition. It is worth mentioning that other focus particles don't seem to have a similar effect. For example, the additive particle *too* in (14) isn't licensed by somebody also having announced his name nor by you having announced your date of birth previously.

(14)   #What is your name too?

As we mentioned, *wieder/noch mal* and *again* in *wh*-questions lead to an ambiguity between the remind-me presupposition and an event repetition presupposition,[7] that is also available with declaratives. In examples like (2), our world knowledge that multiple name-changes are rare blocks the event repetition reading. But the example in (15) clearly allows both readings. Interestingly, though, as (15) also shows, the placement of focal stress disambiguates between the two readings: When the repetitive particle is unstressed in (15a), the remind-me reading is preferred. When the repetitive particle, however, bears stress only the event repetition reading is available. As (15b) shows, the stress can be either on the first or the second part of German *noch mal* (lit. 'another time').

(15)   a.   Wann ist sie *noch mal* DRAN?
            when is she again   on turn
            'Remind me: when is it her turn?' (remind-me reading)

            [?]'When does she have another turn?' (event repetition reading)

       b.   Wann ist sie NOCH mal / noch MAL dran?
            when is she again   / again   on turn

---

[7]Here and in the following, it doesn't seem necessary for our purposes to distinguish between the repetitive and restitutive readings of von Stechow (1996) and others. We intend the term *event repetition reading* to cover both of these readings.

'When does she have another turn?' (event repetition reading)

*'Remind me: when is it her turn?' (remind-me reading)

In Japanese, iterative particles like *again* exist, but they cannot trigger remind-me readings. This is shown in (16a) for *mata* ('again') in either sentence medial or initial position, and in (17) for *mooichido* ('again', literally 'one more time') also in sentence medial and initial position.

(16)   a.   Namae-wa   mata nan-desu ka? (JAPANESE)
                 Name-Topic again what-is   Q

       b.   Mata namae-wa   nan-desu ka?
                 again name-Topic what-is   Q

(17)   a.   Namae-wa   mooichido nan-desu ka? (JAPANESE)
                 Name-Topic again   what-is   Q

       b.   Mooichido namae-wa   nan-desu ka?
                 again   name-Topic what-is   Q

All four questions in (17) and (16) are grammatical, but they only have an interpretation where the speaker changed his/her name once and changed it back to the original.[8] This interpretation is similar to the one available in English and German when the repetitive particle occurs in a declarative shown in (3) above. A remind-me reading is not available in (16) or (17). The remind-me presupposition can in Japanese only be triggered by the suffix *kke* as we already showed with (5) above, which as far as we can tell has no other uses than triggering remind-me presuppositions. In sum, we showed in this section that the particles *noch mal/wieder* in German and *again* in English can and that Japanese *kke* must trigger a remind-me presupposition in questions and that the particles do so in an independent way from past tense.

---

[8]If *mooichido* is followed by a pause, example (17b) also allows a reading where it is presupposed that I asked you the same question in the past. This is mentioned for (4) above and clearly different from the remind-me presupposition.

Speech-Acts and Remind-Me Reading

In this section, we show how the particles that trigger the remind-me presupposition relate to the speech act and sentence type of the sentence they occur in. We already mentioned two central observations in the introduction: For one, remind-me presuppositions are restricted to questions, and secondly, the availability of remind-me readings in polar questions varies between languages: Japanese allows them, but in German they are impossible. In the following, we support and sharpen up both of these observations further with additional data. Specifically, we argue first that remind-me readings are restricted to question speech-acts that have also the sentence type question. And secondly, we corroborate the German–Japanese difference with polar questions, and discuss that English seems to have an intermediate status.

Consider first the restriction to matrix questions. For German and English, the contrast of the remind-me questions in (1) and (2) with the declarative (3) shows that declaratives don't allow the repetitive particles to trigger a remind-me presupposition. This shows that the availability of remind-me presupposition in German and English is due to the interaction between the repetitive particles and the question semantics. In Japanese, any sentence with the suffix *kke* is interpreted as a question, so the link between questions and *kke* might be more direct: *kke* might be a question marking particle itself like the normal question marking particle *ka* in (18a). In the data with *kke* shown so far (e.g. (5)), *kke* seems to in fact take the place of *ka*, which doesn't occur. However, several Japanese speakers also accept examples like (18b), where both *kke* and *ka* occur.

(18)   a.   Namae-wa nan   desu-ka? (JAPANESE)
            name-TOP what COP-Q
            'What is your name?'

       b.   Namae-wa nan   da-kke-ka?
            name-TOP what COP-KKE-Q
            'What is your name again?'

Fact (18b) makes it plausible that *kke* isn't itself a question marker, but an independent particle

interacting with the question interpretation to yield the remind-me reading.

While matrix questions allow remind-me readings, they are absent from embedded questions. Specifically, (19) shows that ungrammaticality results when *kke* is suffixed to an embedded clause in Japanese.

(19) *doko-ni   simatta-kke   siri-tai   desu. (JAPANESE)
      where-LOC put away-KKE know-want COP

In German, (Krifka, 2003, p. 10) argues that in some cases question embedding verbs can embed speech acts on the basis of the distribution of the modal particle *denn*. This distinction is reflected in the data with *noch mal* in (20): In (20a), *noch mal* ('again') can receive only the pragmatically infelicitous reading presupposing multiple name changes on your behalf. This corresponds to Krifka's arguement that the use of *wissen* ('know') in (20a) is what he calls *extensional*, which doesn't allow embedding of speech acts. But (20b) allows a remind-me reading, where it is actually Cora who wants to be reminded, not the speaker.[9] The remind me interpretation of *noch mal* differs from the interpretation of (20c) where *noch mal* takes scope in the matrix clause: Only (20c) requires a scenario where Cora knew your name in the past. Hence, *noch mal* in (20b) must be interpreted in some relation with an embedded question speech act. This is predicted by Krifka's analysis since it predicts that (20b) as an *intensional* question embedding verb should allow embedded speech acts.

(20) a. Cora weiß, was (# noch mal) dein Name ist.
          Cora knows what (# again)   your name is
          'Cora know what (# again) your name is.'

      b. Cora will   wissen, was noch mal dein Name ist.
          Cora wants know   what again   your name is

---

[9]All previous German examples such as (2) asking about the name used the interrogative pronoun *wie* ('how') rather than *was* ('what') because this sounds more polite. It may be that German speakers use *wie* to avoid the use of *was* for the addressee's name, though syntactically and semantically *was* ought to be appropriate. In (20b), however, *was* ('what') sounds more natural than *wie*, though both are possible. Since the responsibility of the speaker for the embedded speech-act in (20b) is lower than for matrix speech-acts as in (2).

'Cora wants to know what your name is and Cora thinks your name was known before?'

c. Cora will noch mal wissen, was dein Name ist.
Cora wants again know what your name is
'Cora wants to again know what your name is?'

Following Krifka, we regard embedded speech-acts as cases of embedded root clauses where the speaker parameter is shifted. Therefore the presence of a version of a remind-me reading in (20b) is expected, and actually confirms our claim that remind-me readings are restricted to matrix questions. In Japanese, the ungrammaticality of (19) indicates that embedded root questions are more restricted than in German.

Finally consider the observation in (21) the relation between remind-me readings and sentence type. It is well-known that in many cases declarative with rising intonation can function in ways similar to questions (e.g. Gunlogson 2013). However, rising declaratives generally don't allow remind-me readings. This is unsurprising for rising declaratives that function as polar interrogatives in German since we already mentioned in (6) above that polar interrogatives in German don't allow remind-me readings. But, the restriction also applies to the rising declaratives containing an indefinite like (21b). Without the repetitive particle *noch mal* ('again'), both (21a) and (21b) could be answered in the same way by a list of people I have in mind. But despite this functional similarity, only the real question (21a) allows a remind-me reading. *Noch mal* ('again') in (21b) must be interpreted as triggering a repetitive presupposition that is also available in declaratives. This observatoin indicates that remind-me readings are dependent on the sentence type question, not just on the speaker's intented speech act.

(21) a. Wen hast Du noch mal im Sinn?
Who have you again in the mind
'Who do you have in mind again?'

b. Du hast (#noch mal) jemand im Sinn.
you have (#again) some in the mind

'You have someone in mind (#again)'

Now consider more specifically the types of question that can license a remind-me reading. The generalization, we establish in the following is the one we already mentioned in the introduction: In German, constituent questions allow remind-me readings, but polar questions don't. But in Japanese, both constituent questions and polar questions allow remind-me readings. We furthermore note that the data with polar questions in English are difficult to evaluate since it involves some inter-speaker variation.

In constituent questions in German, remind-me readings are available independent of the interrogative pronoun. In the German data so far, we showed already remind-me readings with the interrogative pronouns *wie* ('how') in (2), *was* ('what') in (20b), and *wen* ('who.ACC') in (21a). (22a) illustrates that complex *wh*-phrases, pied piped *wh*-phrases, and degree questions also license remind-me readings, while (22b) illustrates the remind-me reading with different adjuncts. In all examples, the remind-me reading is the only felicitous interpretation, because the verbs used are not compatible with repeated action.

(22)   a.   {Welche Bücher / Wessen Bücher / Wieviele Bücher} hat er noch mal vernichtet?
               {which   books / whose books / how many books} has he again   destroyed
               'Which books / Whose books / How many books did he destroy again?'

      b.   {Wann / Warum / Wie / In welchem Alter ist sie noch mal gestorben?
               {when / why   / how / in which   age} is she again   died
               'When / Why / How / At which age did she die again?'

Multiple questions also allow a remind-me reading as illustrated by (23). The presupposition of (23) is that the complete answer to the question was contributed to the discourse, not only a partial answer.

(23)   Wer hat noch mal was   zerstört?
       who has again   what destroyed

       'Who destroyed what again?'

In contrast to the general availability of remind-me readings with constituent questions, remind-me readings are impossible with polar questions in German as we already illustrated with (6) above and also (24) shows. The only interpretation available for (24) is one assuming a rebuilding of the tower between two destructions—the remind-me reading is impossible.

(24) #Hat sie noch mal den Verteidigungsturm zerstört?
      has she again   the defense tower   destroyed

      'Did she again destroy the defense tower?'

Note furthermore that alternative questions behave like constituent questions: unlike the polar question (24), (25) allows a remind-me reading. This is predicted by an analysis of alternative questions as a type of constituent question such as that of Nicolae (2013). The fact in (25) shows that the verb-initial structure that polar and alternative questions share in German is compatible with a remind-me reading.

(25) #Hat sie noch mal den Verteidigungsturm oder die Brücke zerstört.
      has she again   the defense tower   or   the bridge destroyed

      'Which of the defense tower and the bridge was it again that she destroyed?'

Furthermore, note that past tense can trigger a remind-me reading of polar questions in German: (26) illustrates this and also shows that even when the remind-me reading is present for a polar question, insertion of *noch mal* ('again') still triggers the event repetition presupposition in addition. The fact in (26) further corroborates that past tense and the repetitive particle can independently trigger remind-me presuppositions in constituent questions as we proposed above. The triggering by past tense, via presupposed salience of a past time interval, is predicted to be available with polar questions as well. So (26) underscores that something specific to *noch mal* blocks it from bringing about remind-me readings.

(26) Hattest   Du (#noch mal) grüne Augen?
      have-PAST you (#again)   green eyes

'Remind me: Did you have green eyes?'

Now consider Japanese in comparison. As far as we can tell, it doesn't differ from German for constituent and alternative questions, but for polar questions we already noted in (7) (repeated in (27a)) a difference. Generally, remind-me readings are unproblematically available with polar questions in Japanese and (28) is just another example.

(27) a. Namae-wa Kai-da-kke?   (JAPANESE)
          name-Top Kai-COP-KKE
          'Tell me again whether your name is Kai.'

      b. Anata-no me-wa midori-datta-kke

          you-GEN eye-TOP green-COP-KKE

          'Tell me again whether your eyes are green?'

The German and Japanese judgements on the availability of remind-me readings in polar questions are shared by all speakers we consulted and seem generally clear to them. For English *again*, however, there seems to be some inter-speaker variation. Specifically, we found variation with example (28) in the following scenario: We meet up at a concert. When you arrive, you listed for me which of the musicians you know: 'Albert, I don't know, Bill, I know, …'. But, I forget and sometime later wonder whether you know Bill.

(28) %Do you know Bill again?

While some English speakers reject (28), we found that other English speakers judge (28) to be acceptable. For the respective translations of (28) to German and Japanese, we found no such variability in speakers' judgments, but uniform unacceptability in German, and uniform acceptability in Japanese. At this point, we don't have the resources to investigate the English data in more detail. But, the explanation of the German-Japanese contrast we offer in the following predicts that English in some relevant ways behaves like German and in others like English.

In sum, the descriptive generalizations we established here is that remind-me readings can only arise in matrix questions that have the sentence type question. In German, remind-me are further restricted: polar questions in German don't allow remind-me readings. In Japanese and to a lesser extent in English this constraint doesn't apply.

Position of the Remind-Me Particle

One of the most noticeable difference between *kke* in Japanese and *noch mal* in German concerns their position in the sentence. Japanese *kke* is a suffix that attaches to the tensed verb. Because Japanese is a verb-final language, *kke* occurs sentence-finally in all examples we have seen from (5) on. German *noch mal*, however, can occur in sentence-medial positions as (2) already illustrates. The positions remind-me *noch mal* and also remind-me *wieder* for those speakers that allow it can occupy are a subset of where those temporal adverbials can occupy. This observation accounts for the fact that *noch mal* in many examples can also trigger the event repetition interpretation rather than the remind-me interpretation.[10]

Word order in German is generally more flexible than in English (Haider, 2010), and like other adverbs the position of remind-me *noch mal* ('again') can also vary. For example, the word order in (29) instead of (2) is also fully grammatical and has the same intrepretation as (2).

(29)   Wie ist Ihr   Name noch mal? (GERMAN)
       how is your name again

       'What is your name again?'

That *noch mal* occupies a sentence final position in (29) is only possible because the finite verb *ist* ('is') has moved to the second position. With a periphrastic verb form, however, the non-finite part of the verb remains in final position, and as (30) shows *noch mal* must preceed the sentence final part of the verb.

---

[10]Stechow 1996 and Beck and Johnson (2004) discuss the positions event repetition *wieder* and *again* can occupy, and how they affect interpretation in detail.

(30) *Was ist (noch mal) ihr Name (noch mal) gewesen (*noch mal?) (GERMAN)
      what is (again)   her name (again)   been   (again)

      'What was her name again?'

We have seen so far that *noch mal* cannot occur in positions, that other adverbs also cannot occur in. But the distribution of remind-me *noch mal* is more restricted than that of adverbs as we show now: for one, remind-me *noch mal* is subject to the restrictions on discourse particles, and secondly it is subject to intervation effects. First we show that remind-me *noch mal* exhibits restrictions similar to other discourse particles in German: (Bayer and Obenauer, 2011, p. 465–467) argue that discourse particles are generally blocked from occurring in embedded clauses.[11] Example (31) shows that remind-me *noch mal* is also subject to this restriction.

(31) #Wer hat (noch mal) erzählt, dass sie (#noch mal) Tamilisch kann.
      who has (again)   narrated that she (again)   Tamil   can

      'Remind me: Who said that she knows Tamil.'

Secondly, consider intervention effects. Sauerland (2009) already notes the data in (32) and (33) that show a further restriction on remind-me readings. While Sauerland (2009) doesn't provide an account of these data, we suggest that remind-me *wieder* is subject to intervention effects in the following sense: We use the term *intervention effects* following Beck (1996, 2006) who shows that *wh*-in-situ phrases in German cannot be c-commanded by certain quantificational operators (see also Mayr 2010). Sauerland (2009) discusses the contrast in (32), while (32a) is grammatical, the universal quantifier *jeder* ('everyone') intervenes in (32b) since *jeder* c-commands *noch mal/wieder* ('again') in (32b).

---

[11]Bayer and Obenauer (2011) discuss example (i) where an interrogative phrase has been extracted from the embedded clause and the discourse particle *denn* can occur in the embedded clause.

(i)   Wie denkst du, dass es denn weiter-gehen soll   mit Euch
        how think   you that it DENN onwards-go   should with you.PL

Remind-me *noch mal* also seems to be marginally possible in such examples:

(ii)   Wie denkst du, dass es noch mal weiter-gehen soll   mit Euch
        how think   you that it again   onwards-go   should with you.PL

(32) a. Was hat noch mal/wieder jeder   bestellt?
          what has again   everyone ordered
          'Tell me again what everybody ordered.'

      b. ??Was hat jeder   noch mal/wieder bestellt?
          what has everyone again   ordered

The data in (32) contrast with the data in (33) as (Sauerland, 2009) notes. In (33), the subject is not a quantifier and the remind-me reading is available for *noch mal* and *wieder* also in the post-subject position. This difference between quantificational and non-quantificational elements is predicted if Beckian intervention is causing the problem with (32b).

(33) a. Was hat noch mal/wieder Manfred bestellt?
          what has again   everyone ordered
          'Tell me again what Manfred ordered.'

      b. Was hat Manfred noch mal/wieder bestellt?
          what has everyone again   ordered
          'Tell me again what Manfred ordered.'

Consider also the further data in (34). The intervention effect arises in (34a) with the negative quantifier *fast keiner* ('almost noone'). (34b) shows again that the effect disappears when the intervening subject is not a quantifier, and (34c) shows that there is no intervention when *fast keiner* doesn't c-command remind-me *noch mal*.

(34) a. #Welche Sprache kann fast   keiner noch mal sprechen?
          which   language can almost noone again   talk
          *'Remind me: Which language can almost noone speak?'

      b. Welche Sprache kann er noch mal sprechen?
          which language can   he again   speak
          'Remind me: Which language can he speak?'

      c. Welche Sprache kann noch mal fast   keiner sprechen?
          which language can   again   almost noone talk
          'Remind me: What language can almost noone speak?'

Finally, note that an *in situ* interrogative phrase also is an intervener for remind-me *noch mal*. This is illustrated by the contrast between (23) above and (35), where*noch mal* follows the *in situ wh*-phrase.

(35) **?*Wer hat was noch mal zerstört?
      who has what again   destroyed

We take this pattern of intervention with *wh*-in situ to indicate the remind-me *noch mal* is associated with a higher position in the left periphery of the question than the *in situ wh*-phrase.

      In summary, the above data show that remind-me *noch mal* must not be separated from the edge of the matrix clause by either a clause boundary or by a intervening quantificational element even though it usually occurs in sentence-medial adverb positions. For Japanese *kke*, these considerations don't apply because *kke* must always occur in a sentence final position in the edge of the matrix clause.

3   Speech Act Decomposition

In the following, we present our account of the facts discussed in the previous section. Our account for German follows mostly the sketch of (Sauerland, 2009). We specifically show how that account straightforwardly derives several descriptive generalizations we established in the previous section, specifically the dependence of the remind-me reading on the sentence type question and the syntactic restrictions on the position of remind-me *noch mal*. Sauerland (2009), however, didn't observe the data with polar questions. We show that these data further support the speech act decomposition account. Specifically, we argue that the German-Japanese difference with remind-me presuppositions in polar questions relates to whether the particle that trigger the presupposition must undergo movement to edge of the clause to trigger the presupposition or whether the trigger is already base-generated in the right position. We then relate this to the indepedent observation that scopal movement from polar questions is blocked. In sum then remind-me readings of repetitive

particles are predicted to be impossible in polar questions because languages like German require movement for the particle to trigger a remind-me presupposition.

The Basic Account

One central motivation for the speech act decomposition account is the assumption that repetitive particles like *noch mal* ('again') have the same lexical semantics when they trigger a remind-me interpretation as for the event repetition reading. Specifically, we adopt the lexical entry (Stechow, 1996, p. 95) provides for *again* in the following. Stechow's account assumes the notion of event and that events are partially ordered in time by both the temporal precedence relation $<$ and also the inclusion relation $\sqsubseteq$. Furthermore, Stechow makes use of a maximization operator, *max*, that turns a predicate of events P into a different one that is only true of events e of which P is maximally true (i.e. there is no $e' \sqsupset e$ with $P(e')$). Then we assume in general the following lexical entry for repetitive particles, i.e. both German *noch mal* and *wieder* ('again'), and also English *again*). We define a general AGAIN particle in (36) and assume that $[\![\text{again}]\!] = [\![\text{wieder}]\!] = [\![\text{noch mal}]\!]$.[12]

(36)　$[\![\text{AGAIN}]\!](p)(e)$ is defined, iff. $\exists e' < e \max(p)(e') = 1$ and $e' < e$, and, where defined, $[\![\text{AGAIN}]\!](p)(e) = 1$ iff. $p(e) = 1$

Stechow (1996) argues that *wieder* in German can attach to different positions of the clause to explain data such as (37) using structural ambiguity. These German data are given in the verb-final word order of a German embedded clause, so need to be suitably completed as indicated by the elision dots. The ambiguity von Stechow addresses is that in (36a) the presupposition *again* triggers can be only that the aircraft was on the ground before—the *restitutive* presupposition. This interpretation isn't available for (36b), which can only have the stronger *repetitive* presupposition that the aircraft has landed before.

---

[12]We assume that there is a syntactic difference between *wieder* and *noch mal* for those speakers that prefer *noch mal* to express a remind-me presupposition. This syntactic difference blocks *wieder* from the relevant position where *noch mal* triggers the remind-me presupposition.

(37)   (Stechow, 1996, p. 107)

    a.   . . . das Flugzeug wieder landete
         . . . the aircraft   again landed
         '. . . the plane again landed' (repetitive/restitutive)

    b.   . . . wieder das Flugzeug landete
         . . . again the aircraft   landed
         '. . . again the plane landed' (repetitive/*restitutive)

To account for the difference, von Stechow proposes that unaccusative verbs like *landen* ('land')
are decomposed into the light verb BECOME and a stative part, specifically *(be) on land* for *landen*.
The subject is based generated as the argument of *(be) on land*, but must move overtly into the
subject position in the specifier of BECOME. Then only (37a) allows the structure (38a), where
again is attached to the stative part of the unaccusative. In this structure, *again* triggers the weaker,
restitutive presupposition. For (37b), only structure (38b) is available where *again* applies to the
small vP including BECOME, which triggers the stronger repetitive presupposition.

(38)   a.   [the aircraft] λ_x [**again** [x on land]] BECOME

    b.   **again** [[the aircraft] λ_x [x on land] BECOME]

On von Stechow's account, the complement of *again* directly determines the presupposition it trig-
gers. For a similar explanation of the remind-me reading, we require that there be a constituent
with a meaning p such that p applied to a past interval yields the remind-me presupposition. Sauer-
land (2009) sketches such an account of the remind-me reading building on an analysis of question
meaning by Truckenbrodt. Truckenbrodt (2004) argues that the meaning of the sentence-type
question should generally be described as an order to contribute the answer to the question to the
common ground. One point that Truckenbrodt makes is that his proposal explains why questions
can be used not only by speakers who don't know the answer, but also by, for example, teachers
and quizmasters in exams. In this scenario, the speaker wants the addressee to show to the public
whether the addressee knows the right answer, while the speaker might well know the answer.

The common ground also plays a role in the remind me presupposition as we saw above. But the remind-me presupposition doesn't contain Truckenbrodt's entire question meaning: Rather as we pointed out above, the remind-me presupposition is satisfied as long as somebody contributed the answer to the question to common ground in the past. If the entire question meaning was the argument of *again*, only the interpretation that I asked you the same question previously could be generated. As we discussed above, this interpretation is distinct from the remind-me reading and actually not available with clause-medial *wieder/noch mal* in German. For this reason, Sauerland (2009) suggests a decomposition of the question meaning into at least two components, which we now want to make more concrete. Spefically we suggest that questions contain of the imperative morpheme IMP-2 and a second morpheme that we call CG, and that both morphemes head silent projections as in the structure in (39).[13]

(39)   IMP-2 [CG [what is your name?]]

For IMP-2, we assume the same meaning as the general meaning of imperatives: the speaker obliges the addressee to do what the complement of IMP-2 specifies. As far as we can see, our specific analysis is compatible with a variety of accounts of IMP-2, but for concreteness we adopt the universal modal analysis of Schwager (2005); Kaufmann (2012) in (40). Kaufmann argues first that imperatives themselves generally contain two pieces of silent structure, the core imperative part IMP and part restricting imperative subject to the second person. Consider first IMP: Kaufmann argues that IMP like the necessity modal *must* (Kratzer, 1977) takes two contextual parameters (f and g) in addition to a possible world argument w, and that the meaning of IMP consists of universal quantification over a set of possible worlds determined from the contextual parameters and w by an operator that Kaufmann writes as O.

(40) $[\![\text{IMP}]\!](f, g, w)(p) = 1$ iff. $\forall w' \in O(f, g, w) p(w') = 1$ (Schwager, 2005, p. 99)

---

[13]Meyer (2013) argues that declaratives contain a silent necessity modal she abbreviates K. Meyer's K might be related to our CG, but at this point we leave the relationship open.

Kaufmann argues furthermore that imperatives require that the subject of the constituent corresponding to p must at least overlap with the addressee(s), and develops an agreement analysis to capture this restriction. Since this is of no importance to the following, we skip the details of her account and abbreviate it in the following way: We assume that the IMP-2 of the structure in (39) is in fact decomposed further as in (41) into Kaufmann's IMP, a silent subject pronoun *pro-2* with second person agreement, and the light verb DO.

(41)   IMP *pro-2* DO [CG [what is your name?]]

The interpretation of DO takes three arguments, a predicate of events p, the subject x, and a possible world w, and expresses that, in w, subject x causes an event that makes p true (Davidson 1967 and others).

(42) $[\![\text{DO}]\!](p)(x)(w) = 1$ iff. $\exists e\ x$ causes in w the event e with $p(e) = 1$

In the following, we go back to use IMP-2 as in (39) in the decomposition of question speech acts for reasons of brevity. We understand this throughout as an abbreviation for Kaufmann's more detailed structure for imperatives.

The preceeding discussion leaves the meaning of CG to be determined within the structures (40) and (42). Since the idea is that *again* in its remind-me reading can take scope over CG, the meaning of CG must correspond to the remind-me presupposition. The lexical entry is required to accomplish this correspondence. The two arguments of CG in the structure in (43) are the question and an event, but in addition CG is sensitive to the current speaker as we show in the following.[14]

(43) $[\![\text{CG}]\!]^{\sigma}(q^{\langle st,t\rangle})(e) = 1$ iff. event e is a discourse and that a) the speaker σ is participating in e and b) the complete answer to q is part of a common ground of e

---

[14]We assume that the current speaker is one of the parameters of interpretation and write it in (43) as a superscript of the interpretation function $[\![\text{—}]\!]$, following Kaplan (1978) and many others.

We assume here that events and common grounds are related in the following way: discourses are special type of events and each discourse event has associated with it a common ground and a set of discourse participants. For ordinary questions, (43) is slightly stronger than Truckenbrodt (2004) proposal because it requires that the speaker be a participant of the common ground that the addressee is asked to contribute the answer to. This strengthening seems generally desirable: If you ask me a question, and then I tell a third person with no relation to you the answer to your question, you wouldn't think I answered your question. There are some potential acceptable cases apparently of this type, but we think is usually an illusion. Consider the following exemplary scenario: For a centralized exam, professor A formulates and distributes a set of questions. But the answers are read and graded by assistants, and there is no plan for professor A to see any of this. Professor A's questions here don't oblige the examined students to seek out professor A personally, so it seems initially that (43) is too strong. However, professor A and the teaching assistants doing the grading might well be both taking the role of an abstract persona, e.g. the exam service. Professor A after all might also put in the exam phrases like *please tell me . . .* without obliging students to talk to her personally.

Remind-me readings provide further evidence for the lexical entry of CG in (43). We assume that the remind-me presupposition arise when *again* takes scope over CG as shown in (44).

(44)   IMP-2 [$\overbrace{\text{again [CG [} \underbrace{\text{what is your name?}}_{q} \text{]]}}^{p}$]]

The meaning of (44) corresponds quite closely to the paraphrase *you ought to make it again known to me what your name is.* Specifically, the predicate CG(q) in (44) is true of a discourse e, iff. the current speaker participates in e and the complete answer to q is part of the common ground of e. *Again* adds its presupposition to this predicate, namely that there must be a (possibly partial) discourse e' prior to e such that up until the end of e' the answer to q is part of the common ground of e. Therefore IMP-2 obliges the speaker to bring about an event e where q is answered in e, and presupposes that p is satisfied in any such e. If the presupposed prior discourse e' is completed

before the time of utterance, the remind-me presupposition is the result: Though e' is part of a possible world introduced by the imperative, all worlds the imperative quantifies over share the past with the actual world, and therefore the prior discourse e' must also exist in the actual world. We have not yet ruled out though a second possibility at this point: that e' is completed in the future of the utterance time. However, the remind-me presupposition isn't satisfied in the such a scenario. Consider the contrast between (45a) and (45b). (45a) cannot be understood as a request to remind-me of your name at some later time.

(45)   a.   #What is your name and what is your name (tomorrow) again?

        b.   Tell me now and then tomorrow again what your name is.

We think that (45) relates to a more general difference between overt imperatives and questions: The verb in imperatives can be freely temporally restricted such as by *tomorrow* in (45b), but in questions the silent morphemes CG and DO that we postulated seem to not allow free temporal restriction: (46a) cannot be understood as a request to tell me sometime tomorrow what your name is. Only temporal restrictions that start at the time of utterance as in (46b) are possible with questions. We call this the *Immediacy Constraint*.

(46)   a.   #Tomorrow, what is your name (again)?

        b.   In the next two minutes, what is your thesis about?

At this point, we don't investigate the immediacy constraint further since the rough understanding we have is sufficient to explain the oddness of (45a): The presupposition of *again* could only be satisfied with a restriction to those times past the first answering of the question. But, this kind of restriction would need to start in the future of the utterance time, which is blocked by the immediacy constraint.

The account on the basis of (44) confirms in two ways the specific semantics we provided for CG in (43). Specifically, CG requires that the speaker, but not the addressee, be part of the dis-

course where the question is answered. In (44) this predicts that the speaker, but not the addresses must have participated in the presupposed prior discourse where the answer to the question was contributed to the common ground. In the introduction, we already mentioned a scenario involving an announcer which shows that the addressee of the question need not have been speaking in the presupposed prior discourse. But in that scenario, both speaker and addressee still participated in the prior discourse. Consider first a scenario, where I wasn't part of the prior CG, but you were: Assume we meet at a conference. I know for a fact that you had to say your name at the registration desk just five minutes ago. However, I was in a different room at that time, and I never met you before. In this scenario, (2) isn't acceptable. Compare now a scenario where I was part of the prior CG, but you weren't: Assume I was just talking about you with a group of people not including you. They told me your name and we both know about that, but I forgot your name already. In this scenario, (2) is acceptable. This contrast is expected from the lexical entry of CG in (43).

Our elaboration of the speech act decomposition analysis is complete. The two important assumptions of our analysis are that 1) *noch mal*, *wieder*, and *again* have the normal repetitive meaning, but are attached at the high structural position shown in (44), and that 2) the question speech-act is decomposed into at least two parts: one containing an imperative component, and the other containing a component that makes reference to the common ground. Only one of these components is part of the scope of *again* for the remind-me reading. In the following, we take up two questions that we claim are actually related: 1) Under what structural conditions is *again* licensed to occupy the high position where it triggers the remind-me presupposition. 2) How does the account apply to remind-me readings with *kke* in Japanese.

Polar Questions in German and Japanese

This section argues for a specific explanation within the speech-act decomposition analysis of the German-Japanese difference we observed concerning the availability of a remind-me reading in polar questions. We propose that Japanese *kke* has actually the same lexical interpretation as *again*,

but can only be base-generated in the high structural position in (44). Hence, *kke* can only trigger the remind-me presupposition, not any other event repetition presupposition. German *noch mal* and *wieder*, however, cannot be base-generated in the high position in (44). Instead, they must move to this position. We argue that this proposal explains several restrictions on remind-me readings in German, specifically their unavailability in polar questions, on the basis of independently known restrictions on covert movement. It also predicts that Japanese *kke* isn't subject to these restrictions. We conclude with a brief discussion of the predictions for English, where the facts are as of now unclear as we discussed.

First consider our proposal that *kke* has the same lexical interpretation as *wieder* in (36). As we noted in (16) and (17) above, Japanese has the repetitive particles *mata* and *mooichido*, which can however only express the event-repetition readings, not the remind-me reading. Neither of these two particles can occur in the left periphery of a Japanese question as in (47), where *kke* occur in (5).

(47)   a. *Namae-wa   nan-desu (ka)   mata (ka)? (JAPANESE)
           Name-Topic what-is   again (Q)   again (Q)s

       b. *Namae-wa   nan-desu (ka) mooitido (ka)? (JAPANESE)
           Name-Topic what-is   (Q) again   (Q)

We follow Yatsushiro (1999, 2009) to assume that covert movement is unavailable in Japanese. Then the only way a remind-me reading could be derived in Japanese is by base-generating *again* in the high structural position shown in (44). But, as we see in (48), the repetitive particles are blocked from this position. We assume that *kke* fills what what otherwise be an expressibility gap of Japanese, and carries syntactic features with it that selects for a CG complement to restrict *kke* to this position.

As we discussed above, the overt position *noch mal* and *kke* differ substantially. *kke* occurs in the right periphery of the clause where it is plausible that it takes scope over the lower speech act operator CG as shown in (48a). But *noch mal* can occur only in clause medial positions—we

saw in section (28) above that even when *noch mal* isn't followed by an overt verb, the trace of verb-second movement follows *noch mal*. We assume therefore that *noch mal* must always be base-generated in a position lower than CG. But in contrast to Japanese, German allows covert movement (e.g. Sauerland and Bott 2002; Wurmbrand 2008). If representation (44) of the remind-me readings of repetitive particles is correct, German *noch mal* is required to move to take scope over CG. We therefore postulate that *noch mal* in German can undergo covert movement as shown in (48b).[15]

(48)   a.   IMP-2 [[CG [what your name is]] -KKE]   (Japanese)

     b.   IMP-2 [*noch mal* [CG [what your name — is]]]   (German)

The postulation of covert movement for German remind-me *noch mal* is corroborated by the word order facts discussed in section (28) above. Specifically, the intervention effects noted are straightforwardly predicted by the account of intervention effects of Beck (1996). We noted two kinds of intervention effect with remind-me *noch mal* above: For one a quantifier c-commanding *noch mal* in the overt form caused intervention in (32b) and (34a). This type of intervention is expected if a quantifier constitutes a barrier for covert movement of *noch mal*. Secondly, the lower *wh*-phrase in multiple *wh*-questions also causes an intervention effect. This effect is not observed with *wh*-in-situ as illustrated by the triple *wh*-question in (49). The difference between *wh*-in-situ and *noch mal* is expected, however, because *noch mal* must move to a position higher than the question Spec(CP) that *wh*-in-situ move to.

(49)   Wer   hat wem   was   geschenkt?
     who.NOM has who.DAT what.ACC presented

     'Who gave whom what as a present?'

---

[15]The covert movement postulated in (48b) is unusual in that it doesn't leave behind a trace for interpretation. For now, we only note this specific behavior. We think that only if further cases of such traceless movement are found, it would be possible to understand when movement can be traceless.

In (15) (repeated in (50)), we noted that the remind me reading of *noch mal* is incompatible with focus, while the repetitive reading allows stress.

(50) Wann ist sie noch MAL / noch mal dran?
      when is she again$_F$ / again   on turn

      with focus on *noch MAL*: 'When does she have another turn?' (repetitive, *remind me)

      without focus: 'When is it her turn again?' (remind me / $^?$repetitive)

Coniglio (2011) and others have observed that modal particles in German generally cannot be stressed. Since Coniglio (2011) and Bayer and Obenauer (2011) argue for covert movement of modal particles similar to the movement of *noch mal* that we postulate, the requirement of remind-me *noch mal* to be unstressed is predicted.

Finally, consider the difference between German and Japanese polar questions. We propose that this too is explained by the impossibility of covert movement. Specifically, prior evidence has shown that covert movement out of polar questions is generally impossible (Chierchia, 1993; Moltmann and Szabolcsi, 1994). Furthermore such a general movement restriction on polar questions is predicted by the analysis of polar questions by Nicolae (2013). Let us consider both points in some more detail. The evidence for the movement-blocking effect of polar questions comes from both matrix questions (Chierchia, 1993) and embedded questions. Chierchia (1993) points out that matrix polar questions with quantifiers like (51) don't license a pair-list interpretation. Specifically, the pair-list interpretation of (51) would have the same interpretation as the *wh*-question *Who does John love?*, but that isn't accessible for (51).

(51) Does John love everybody? (Chierchia, 1993, p. 208)

Example (52) and (53) show the evidence Moltmann and Szabolcsi (1994) present with two examples added to create more minimal contrasts. In (52a), *every boy* cannot scope over *whether*, and Mary could've only found out that either every boy needed help or the negation of that. (52b), however, allows a reading where Mary found out the specific needs of each individual boy.

(52)   a.   Mary found out whether every boy needed help. (Moltmann and Szabolcsi, 1994, p.

           387)

      b.   Mary found out what every boy needed.

The difference between (53a) and (53b) concerns wide scope of the embedded subject over the

matrix subject. In (53a), the embedded subject cannot take such wide scope, but in (53b) such a

construal is available.

(53)   a.   Some librarian or other found out whether every boy needed help. ($*\forall \gg \exists$)

      b.   Some librarian or other found out which book every boy needed. ($\forall \gg \exists$) (Moltmann

           and Szabolcsi, 1994, p. 381)

To explain why covert movement out of polar questions is blocked, different proposals have

been made. For our application of the constraint, it is actually immaterial which explanation turns

out to be correct. For concreteness, consider the recent proposal by Nicolae (2013) to analyze

polar questions as conditionals. In a nutshell, Nicolae proposes that (54a) is analyzed like (54b)

(Nicolae, 2013, p. 157). To make Nicolae's proposal fully compatible with our assumptions, we

adopt the structure in (54c) for polar questions where IF is the polar question complementizer.

(54)   a.   Did Mary order?

      b.   I want to know if Mary ordered.

      c.   IMP-2 [[IF λ_q $q = {}^{\wedge}$(Mary ordered)] λ_p [CG t_p]]

The lexical entry for IF we adopt from Nicolae takes it to be a universal quantifier over propositions:

$[\![\text{IF}]\!] = \lambda P^{\langle st,t\rangle} \lambda Q^{\langle st,t\rangle} \forall p\, (P(p) \to Q(p))$. The first argument of IF in (54c) is the unit set of the

proposition *Mary ordered*. So (54c) obliges the addressee to make it shared knowledge that Mary

ordered in case she did so. Nicolae argues for this proposal using facts from the licensing of

negative polarity items in polar questions. However, her conditional analysis also predicts that

for the purposes of extraction, polar questions should behave like conditionals and not like other questions. The data in (51) to (53) corroborate this prediction of Nicolae's analysis.

In sum, we see that covert movement out of questions is impossible with polar questions but possible with other questions. This generalization together with the assumption that *noch mal* in German must move for the remind-me interpretation but *kke* in Japanese need not, predicts the distribution of remind-me readings in both languages correctly. The diagrams in (48) above showed already why the remind-me reading in Japanese can be derived without covert movement: *kke* occupies a sentence final position where it can scope above CG in situ. (48) also showed that in German *noch mal* must move from a sentence medial position to a position in the periphery to take scope above CG. The two derivations in (55) show how the remind-me reading of a polar question can be derived in Japanese, while it is blocked in German.

(55)   a.   IMP-2 [[IF your name is Kai] λ_p [[CG t_p] -KKE]]   (Japanese)

        b.   IMP-2 [[IF your name — is Kai] λ_p *noch mal* [CG [t_p]]]   (German)
                                                                    *

Consider first the interpretation that derived for the Japanese example (55a). Since we assume that *kke* lexically selects for CG as its complement, the IF-clause must move to a position higher than *kke*. The interpretation arising from (55a) can be paraphrased as follows: I want you to, if your name is Kai, make that again known. The presupposition *kke* triggers in (55a) is that it was known before that your name is Kai. This interpretation corresponds to the remind-me reading, because a polar question with *kke* indeed conveys a bias that the response 'yes' is expected by the speaker. The derivation (55b) on the other hand is ruled by syntactic principles. For example, it violates the c-command restriction on movement and also the constraint on movement out of conditional clauses.

The interspeaker variation of English that mentioned above can also be accounted for within the present proposal. Observe that *again* in (56) occurs in sentence final position. Therefore the

sentence is predicted to be structurally ambiguos as shown in (56). When *again* is attached low as in (56a), only the event-repetition reading is predicted to be possible. But, (56b) is predicted to have only the remind-me reading, just like the Japanese (55a). So, if an English speaker can access structure (56b), he or she is predicted to allow the remind-me interpretation. This predicts that remind-me readings in polar questions should be more accessible than in German, but at the same time remind-me readings are expected to be less accessible in English than in Japanese. Specifically, English has the ambiguity in (56) while Japanese has only the one structure in (55a), and furthermore there is a general processing preference in English to attach modifier low.

(56)   a.   IMP-2 [CG [Is your name Kai again]]

       b.   IMP-2 [[CG Is your name Kai] again]

The account in terms of ambiguous attachment is confirmed by the contrast between *again* in final vs. medial position in (57). In (57b), the remind-me interpretation is predicted to be unavailable.

(57)   a.   Do you know Spanish again?

       b.   #Do you again know Spanish?

One further prediction of the approach to is also borne out. We observed above that alternative questions even in German allow a remind-me reading. This is predicted because Nicolae (2013) argues that alternative questions don't have the conditional-like structure in (54), but instead analyzes them as a variety of *wh*-question. Therefore movement of *noch mal* is predicted to be available.[16]

---

[16]Our analysis initially seems to predict that polar alternative questions should also allow remind-me readings in German since they don't involve a conditional structure. However, in a polar alternative question like (i) the coordinate structure constraint is expected to block movement of *again*. Therefore, we correctly predict the unavailability of a remind-me reading.

(i)   #Heisst Du noch mal Kai oder nicht?
            named you again   Kai or   not

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented as far as we know the first in depth discussion of remind-me readings of questions. These readings illustrated in (58) are characterized by a presupposition that the answer to the question was already known in the past. Our data from English, German, and Japanese showed substantial variation in the surface form : in English (58a) and German (58b), repetitive particles can trigger the remind-me presupposition, however, their position in the sentence differs. Japanese (58c) uses the special particle *kke* that only ever occurs with remind-me readings.

(58) a. What is your name again?

 b. Wie ist noch mal Ihr Name?
 how is again   your name

 c. namae-wa nan da-kke
 name-TOP what COP-KKE

In addition, we found variation with respect to whether remind-me readings are available in polar questions for the above particles: Japanese allows this, but German doesn't, while in English the reading is marginally available. Our analysis relates the variation in (58) and the absence of remind-me readings with polar questions to one another.

One central tenet of our analysis is to reduce the remind-me use of *again* and *noch mal* in (58) to the repetitive particle. Following the analysis sketched by Sauerland (2009), we argued that the reduction to the repetitive particle requires decomposition of the question speech act into at least two parts: an imperative part and a part related to knowing the answer to a question. In our analysis, we introduced the abstract morpheme IMP-2 and CG and proposed that *again* is able to scope between these two as shown schematically in (59).

(59) IMP-2 [*again* [CG what is you name]]

The interpretation of (59) can roughly be paraphrased as follows: You ought to make it again known again what your name is. We showed that the interpretation of (59) captures the remind-me

reading well. Furthermore, the proposal extends to Japanese if *kke* also has the lexical meaning of a repetitive particle. Our proposal therefore successfully reduces the variation in (58) to a set of language-universal speech act morphemes and the repetitive particle meaning associated with different lexical entries.

Finally we related the word order difference shown in (58) to the availability of remind-me readings in polar questions. Specifically, German *noch mal* must undergo covert movement to the position above CG in (59), but Japanese *kke* is base-generated in this position. Since there is independent evidence that polar questions block covert movement, the absence of the remind-me interpretation with polar questions in German is predicted. The reduction of the German-Japanese contrast to independent principles therefore corroborates our account of remind-me readings.

We think perhaps the most interesting aspect of the remind-me readings is that they allow us to empirically evaluate different accounts of speech acts. Specifically, one aspect of our proposal relates to a discussion over the classification of question speech acts that started with the well-known theory of Searle (1975). Recall that Searle proposed that five basic types of speech acts (Assertive, Directive, Commissive, Expressive, and Declarative), but questions were a subtype of the directives in Searle's classificatio,. Searle arrived at this classification primarily based on philosophical considerations: Namely questions and other directives oblige the addressee to undertake some activity to change the world according to the content of the utterance. But, as far as we know, most current work on speech acts assumes that Searle's classification of questions was wrong, and they constitute a type of their own. For example, Zaefferer (2001, 2006) argues explicitly against Searle's classification of questions on the basis of a typological generalization he observes: *All languages have interrogative structures, all languages have imperative structures, but nowhere are the former a specialization of the latter* (Zaefferer, 2001, p. 211). More frequently, though, authors just assume questions as a basic type of entity making up discourses: For example Portner (2004) develops a theory of clause types where declarative, imperative, and question each correspond to a distinct entity, namely the common ground, the *to-do list*, and the *question set*.

Less ambitous proposals of a similar nature distinguish only a question under discussion (Roberts, 1996) from the common ground. Our data, however, corroborate Searle's proposal empirically. In fact, they support a stronger version of that proposal than Searle might have had in might. Searle intent was primarily to create a taxonomy. But if our proposal is correct, all questions at least in Japanese and German involve the imperative morpheme. We speculated that, if results similar to ours could be extended to other clause types and languages, a universal inventory of clause-type dependent silent speech-act operators such as our IMP and CG could be established leading to a limited revival of the performative hypothesis of Ross (1970).

Bibliography

Bayer, J., Obenauer, H.-G., 2011. Discourse particles, clause structure, and question types. The Linguistic Review 28, 449–491.

Beck, S., 1996. Quantified structures as barriers for LF movement. Natural Language Semantics 4, 1–56.

Beck, S., 2006. Intervention effects follow from focus interpretation. Natural Language Semantics 14, 1–56.

Beck, S., Johnson, K., 2004. Double objects again. Linguistic Inquiry 35, 97–123.

Chierchia, G., 1993. Questions with quantifiers. Natural Language Semantics 1, 181–234.

Coniglio, M., 2011. Die Syntax der deutschen Modalpartikeln. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, Germany.

Davidson, D., 1967. The logical form of action sentences. In: Rescher, N. (Ed.), The Logic of Decision and Action. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, Penn., p. 81–95.

Gunlogson, C., 2013. True to form: Rising and falling declaratives as questions in English. Routledge.

Haider, H., 2010. The Syntax of German. Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, D., 1978. On the logic of demonstratives. Journal of Philosophical Logic 8, 81–98.

Kaufmann, M., 2012. Interpreting Imperatives. Springer, Heidelberg, Germany.

Klein, W., 2001. Time and again. In: Audiatur Vox Sapientiae. A Festschrift for Arnim von Stechow. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, pp. 267–286.

Kratzer, A., 1977. What 'must' and 'can' must and can mean. Linguistics and Philosophy 1, 337–355.

Krifka, M., 2003. Quantifiers in questions. Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics 3, 499–526.

Mayr, C., 2010. The Role of Alternatives and Strength in Grammar. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Meyer, M.-C., 2013. Ignorance and Grammar. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Moltmann, F., Szabolcsi, A., 1994. Scope interactions with pair-list quantifiers. In: González, M. (Ed.), Proceedings of NELS 24. University of Massachusetts, GLSA, Amherst.

Musan, R., 1997. Tense, predicates, and lifetime effects. Natural Language Semantics 5, 271–301.

Nicolae, A. C., 2013. Any Questions? Polarity as a Window into the Structure of Questions. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Portner, P., 2004. The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. Proceedings of SALT.

Roberts, C., 1996. Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. In: Yoon, H. J., Kathol, A. (Eds.), OSU Working Papers in Linguistics 49. Ohio State University, Columbus, pp. 91–136.

Ross, J. R., 1970. On declarative sentences. In: Jacobs, R. A., Rosenbaum, P. S. (Eds.), Readings in English Transformational Grammar. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., pp. 222–272.

Sauerland, U., 2009. Decomposing questions acts. Snippets , 62–63.

Sauerland, U., Bott, O., 2002. Prosody and scope in German inverse linking constructions. In: Speech Prosody. URL `http://www.isca-speech.org/archive/sp2002/sp02\_623.pdf`.

Schwager, J. M., 2005. Interpreting Imperatives. Ph.D. thesis, University of Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany.

Searle, J. R., 1975. A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In: Gunderson, K. (Ed.), Language, mind, and knowledge. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

von Stechow, A., 1996. The different readings of *wieder*. Journal of Semantics 13, 87–138.

Stechow, A. v., 1996. The different readings of wieder "again": A structural account. Journal of Semantics 13, 87–138.

Truckenbrodt, H., 2004. Zur Strukturbedeutung von Interrogativsätzen. Linguistische Berichte 199, 313–350.

Wurmbrand, S., 2008. Word order and scope in German. Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik 46, 89–110.

Yatsushiro, K., 1999. Case licensing and VP structure. Ph.D. thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Yatsushiro, K., 2009. The distribution of quantificational suffixes in Japanese. Natural Language Semantics 17, 141–173.

Zaefferer, D., 2001. Deconstructing a classical classification: A typological look at Searle's concept of illocution type. Revue Internationale de Philosophie , 209–225.

Zaefferer, D., 2006. Deskewing the Searlean picture a new speech act ontology for linguistics. In: Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society (BLS-32). Berkeley Linguistics Society. To appear.