Embedding Interrogatives
Maribel Romero

Not all question-embedding verbs are created equal. First, question-embedding verbs do not equally embed *wh*-questions (WhQs), alternative questions (AltQs) and polar questions (PolQs). While *wonder*-type verbs and *know*-type verbs do not discriminate among these question types, *surprise*-type verbs (e.g. *be happy about, annoy, disappoint*) are known to allow WhQs but disallow AltQs and PolQs. This is shown in (1).

(1)   a. John wonders / knows / was surprised at who visited Mary.   WhQ
        b. John wonders / knows / * was surprised at whether Paul$_{L*H-}$ or Bill$_{H*L-}$ visited Mary.
                                                       AltQ
        c. John wonders / knows / * was surprised at whether Paul visited Mary.   PolQ

Second, it has been claimed that question-embedding verbs vary in what readings they allow when embedding a WhQ. While *wonder*-type and *know*-type predicates easily allows for a strongly exhaustive reading, paraphrased in (2), *surprise*-verbs have been argued to allowed only for a weaker reading.

(2)   John knows who (out of them$_C$) walks.
        a. Strongly exhaustive reading:
            'For every x in C that walks, John knows that x walks, and for every x in C that does not walk, John knows that x does not walk.'

This talks presents Romero's (2015) analysis of *surprise*-verbs embedding interrogatives, tying together these two empirical generalizations. Furthermore, some conflicting data pointed out in the recent literature will be examined and couched in Romero's account.