CHAPTER II

DANISH KNOT SENTENCES

In the preceding chapter the crucial examples that showed the failure of a syntactic approach to islands were taken from Danish. These kinds of sentences, which have long intrigued Danish grammarians, have been names 'knot sentences' or 'sentences that are wound together'. Erik Rehling describes them as follows: "A matrix and a subordinate verbal-unit can grow together by a member of the one's being accepted into the other and by its being treated as a member of the second. ... One can, thus, position a member, which logically belongs to the subordinate unit, initially in the matrix sentence, as initial to the whole sentence or [in questioning or relativizing] as a complementizer in the clause." (Rehling, pp. 149-150). Sentences in which extractions had occurred out of that-clauses, embedded questions, and relative clauses were all grouped together as knot sentences and were all considered as being equally out of the normal. The old prescriptive grammarians believed that they should be avoided. Aage Hansen says: "All cases of knots belong especially to the spoken language; the last cases [extraction out of relative clauses] and the aberrant constructions among the rest are characterized by clumsiness, negligence or linguistic audacity." (Hansen (1967) 1, p. 110). The point to note is that ALL extractions out of embedded sentences were considered to be knot sentences and hence abnormal. The issue which will be examined in this chapter is whether Danish knot sentences have anything in common in addition to their name and the fact that they are not considered to be good style. I will show that such a common denominator is indeed to be found, namely, that the condition on extraction proposed in the introduction applies. I shall proceed to examine the various Danish embedded sentences in order to show what the conditions on extraction are.

A. Danish Relative Clauses

(i) A General Description

In order to present the special features of those relative clauses from which extraction is possible, it is necessary to examine the properties of Danish relativization in general. Danish relativization is very similar to English relativization, in that there is a choice between relativizing with wh-words and neutral words such as the English that; however, the latter kind of relativization has become more common. The following are examples of relativization with wh-words:
Manden til hvem jeg henvendte mig var rar.
the man to whom I addressed myself was nice

Hun saa de kulørte lamper fra hvilke der faldt et broget skaer over de dansende.
she saw the colored lamps from which there fell a colorful glow over the dancing (people)

Manden hvis bil jeg købte var rar.
the man whose car I bought was nice

The following might be considered grammatical but would rarely be used in modern speech:

Manden hvem jeg traf var rar.
the man whom I met was nice

Manden hvem jeg henvendte mig til var rar.
the man whom I addressed myself to was nice

Sentences (1)-(3) are examples of relative clauses where the use of wh-words is compulsory, since prepositions cannot be Pied Piped onto som, the Danish equivalent of that:

Manden til som jeg henvendte mig var rar.
the man to that I addressed myself was nice

Manden som jeg henvendte mig til var rar.
the man that I addressed myself to was nice

Hun saa de kulørte lamper fra som der faldt et broget skaer over de dansende.
she saw the colored lamps from that there fell a colorful glow over the dancing

Hun saa de kulørte lamper som der faldt et broget skaer fra over de dansende.
she saw the colored lamps that there fell a colorful glow from over the dancing

No genitive form of som exists:

*Manden soms bil jeg købte var rar.
the man that's car I bought was nice

The examples (4) and (5) do have equivalents with som:

Manden som jeg traf var rar.
the man that I met was nice
Sentences (9) and (10) are much preferable to (4) and (5). It seems that the tendency is to use the wh-words only when no parallel with som exists.

The subject wh-word hvø (=the English who) has become completely extinct. In subject position either som or der can be used:

(11) Manden \{som\} var her igaar var rar.
    \{der\}
    the man that was here yesterday was nice

Der is used only in subject position and is preferred over som in that position by many speakers. Som is obligatorily used in subject position of appositional relative clauses and in conjoined relative clauses, but otherwise no concrete differences between som and der can be found.

Using rules for the complementizer and for relativization proposed by Chomsky (1971a), the following would be the derived structure of (10):

(12)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow \\
NP \\
\downarrow \\
manden \\
\uparrow \\
\downarrow \\
COMP \\
\downarrow -wh \\
som \\
\downarrow \\
jeg henvendte mig til (trace)
\end{array}
\]

whereas (13) would be the derived structure of (1):

(13)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow \\
NP \\
\downarrow \\
manden \\
\uparrow \\
\downarrow \\
COMP \\
\downarrow -wh \\
til hvem \\
\downarrow \\
jeg henvendte mig (trace)
\end{array}
\]
Der has no equivalent in English relative clauses. I would like to argue that der is not in complementizer position as are som and the wh-words, but rather remains in the subject position of the embedded clause:
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The main argument is that der appears only when the subject of the clause is relativized. If der were another option in the complementizer, a condition would have to be imposed to restrict it to the cases where the subject has been relativized. Moreover, the rule inserting der in the complementizer would be no simpler than the one inserting it in place of the subject NP. The latter rule could probably be collapsed with the Danish rule of *there*-insertion, der being inserted in all 'empty' subject positions. Der is the Danish word for *there*, which, as in English, is also limited to subject position. Der-insertion also occurs in subject position of embedded questions and that-clauses, as will be shown later. Moreover, the following pair shows clearly that der does not move out of its subject position (this test was suggested to me by Ross):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(15)] Manden som jeg tror er syg...
  \item[(16)] *Manden der jeg tror er syg...
\end{itemize}

An additional fact which bears out this analysis of the various Danish relative pronouns is that certain speakers will use more than one pronoun in a given sentence. According to Hansen (1967), the order in such cases will always be wh-words, som, der. For example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(17)] Kender du den mand som der har købt den røde villa?
  \hfill Know you that man that there has bought the red villa?
\end{itemize}

Unless Danish is different from English in that it has three nodes in COMP, the analysis suggested above must be correct.

(ii) Knot Sentences Formed from Relative Clauses

Sentences (1), (2) and (48) were examples brought in Chapter 1 to show that extraction is possible out of a subset of Danish rela-
tive clauses. I would like to proceed to illustrate the properties of those relative clauses where extraction is possible. The following are some additional examples:

(18) *Det er der mange der kan lide.*  
that are there many that like  
(There are many who like that)

(19) *Fraansk var vi en lille skare der studerede ivrigt.*  
French were we a little group that studied eagerly  
(We were a little group that studied French eagerly.)

(20) *Det hus kender jeg en mand som har købt.*  
that house know I a man that has bought  
(I know a man who has bought that house.)

(21) *Den stil har jeg nogle elever der har skrevet.*  
that composition have I some pupils that have written  
(I have some pupils who have written that composition.)

The examples show that the matrix must either be the existential operator 'there is' with an indefinite object as in (18), or expressions such as 'we were', 'I know', or 'I have' as in (19)-(21) which can be regarded as being parallel. Consider therefore the application of the dominance test on the source of an example similar to (18). (I shall apply the test to the corresponding English examples to facilitate the reading. The test will give the same results for either language in all cases):

(22) Bill said: "There are many people who like that."

a. , which is a lie -- there aren't.

b. , which is a lie -- many people don't like that.

The test shows that the embedded clause can be considered dominant. According to the condition on extraction proposed in the Introduction which says that the clause from which extraction occurs must be dominant, extraction should be possible in this case; and indeed it is in Danish. I would like to argue, with respect to sentences such as (19)-(21), that their source sentences are also ambiguous with respect to dominance. Like a sentence where a relative clause is embedded to a matrix which consists of the existential operator, the embedded clause can be interpreted as being dominant. It is the fact that there is an interpretation for the sources of these sentences in which the relative clause can be considered dominant which makes extraction possible in accordance with the constraint. The following examples give the dominance test for the sources of the other examples:
(23) Bill said: "We were a little group that studied French eagerly."

a. , which is a lie -- they weren't.

b. , which is a lie -- they (it) didn't.

(24) Bill said: "I know a man who has bought that house."

a. , which is a lie -- he doesn't.

b. , which is a lie -- nobody has.

(25) Bill said: "I have some pupils who have written that composition."

a. , which is a lie -- he hasn't.

b. , which is a lie -- nobody has.

The following long list of examples brings up a point which was mentioned in the Introduction, namely that a matrix takes dominance which is more complex semantically (or, as in (26), where the matrix verb bears emphatic stress).

With respect to the Danish relative clauses, this means that the more complexity is introduced in the matrix, the more difficult it is to interpret this matrix as an introducer parallel to the existential operator:

(26) *Det hus kender jeg en mand som har købt.
that house know I a man who has bought

(27) a. Det er der mange der har gjort.
that are there many who have done

b. Det kender jeg mange der har gjort.
that know I many who have done

c. Det har jeg set mange der har gjort.
that have I seen many who have done

d. Det har jeg mødt mange der har gjort.
that have I met many who have done

e. Det har jeg truffet mange der har gjort.
that have I encountered many who have done
It is difficult to see in some of these examples why one matrix can interpreted as functioning as a mere introducer and another cannot. The following dominance tests illustrate, for a few of the examples, that as one progresses down the list it is more and more
difficult to interpret the embedded clauses as being dominant. When the matrix is sufficiently semantically complex it must unambiguously take dominance.

(28) Bill said: "I have met many people who have done that."
   a. , which is a lie -- he hasn't.
   b. , which is a lie -- nobody has done that.

(29) Bill said: "I have asked many people who have done that."
   a. , which is a lie -- he hasn't.
   b. ?? , which is a lie -- nobody has done that.

(30) Bill said: "I have made fun of many people who have done that."
   a. , which is a lie -- he hasn't.
   b. * , which is a lie -- nobody has done that.

It is interesting to note that not all speakers get the same order of preference among the sentences of (27). (These facts were all supplied by one specific informant.) However, the claim is that whatever the order, it would be reflected by a similar order in the results of the dominance test.

The subset of Danish relative clauses from which extraction is possible differs from other relative clauses not only in that the matrix must be relatively simple, but also in the definiteness of the head of the relative clause:

(31) *Peter kender jeg manden der kan lide.
    Peter know I the man who likes
    (I know the man who likes Peter)

(32) Peter kender jeg en mand der kan lide.
    Peter know I a man who likes
    (I know a man who likes Peter)

These facts follow from the condition on extraction and from the fact that the definite head noun in (31) causes the embedded relative clause to be presupposed. Since a presupposed clause is by definition subordinate, extraction from it is not possible. Thus the subset of Danish relative clauses which allows extraction
is clearly defined by the dominance relations that hold in them. If the relative clause can be interpreted as being dominant, extraction is possible; if the matrix takes dominance due to its being semantically complex or due to the embedded clause being presupposed, then extraction cannot occur.  

I have tried to show up to now that the Danish relative clauses which allow extraction constitute firm evidence in favor of the condition on extraction proposed here. I will discuss the fact that this subset of relative clauses is not structurally distinct from other relative clauses, and hence none of the structural conditions presented in the previous chapter could account for these facts. One aspect of these knot sentences which might help to distinguish these relative clauses from others is the fact that it is only in subject position that der optionally takes the place of som. Moreover, my native informant prefers der to som in many knot sentences. Thus, he would prefer (33) to (34):

\[
\begin{align*}
33. & \quad \text{Suppe kender jeg mange der kan lide.} \\
     & \quad \text{Soup know I many who like} \\
   & \quad \text{b. Her har jeg en onkel der bor.} \\
     & \quad \text{here have I an uncle who lives}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
34. & \quad \text{Suppe kender jeg mange som kan lide.} \\
     & \quad \text{b. Her har jeg en onkel som bor.}
\end{align*}
\]

If it were the case that der was obligatory in all relative knot sentences, then one might suggest that this is the key to the problem, since the whole complementizer node would be empty, according to my analysis that der is in subject position. This is a structural distinction, but: (a) there are acceptable knot sentences with som; and (b) not all relative clauses with der permit extraction.

A second and more probable structural analysis would be that the derivation of these relative clauses is different from the derivation of regular relative clauses. The same kind of syntactic relationship which holds between (35a) and (35b) might be said to hold between (36a) and (36b):

\[
\begin{align*}
35. & \quad \text{People are in the street.} \\
   & \quad \text{b. There are people in the street.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
36. & \quad \text{People like ice cream.} \\
   & \quad \text{b. There are people who like ice cream.}
\end{align*}
\]

This analysis, however, is conceivable only for the cases where the matrix is the existential operator. No structural relation could be posited to hold between (37a) and (37b):
Since (37b) belongs to the subset of relative clauses to be distinguished from other relative clauses, this structural approach does not get us very far.

Still, there is one aspect of knot sentences formed from relative clauses which seems to be structural: namely, it is always the subject of the clause that is relativized, and that consequently, the extracted object is the direct or indirect object. This kind of structural condition on extraction will reappear again and again in the examination of extraction out of other kinds of embedded sentences. The following sentences illustrate the problem:

(38) *Is findes der mange forretninger der sälger til børn.*
    ice cream exist there many stores that sell to children
    (There exist many stores that sell ice cream to children)
    (Subject relativized, direct object extracted)

(39) *Til børn findes der mange forretninger der sälger is.*
    to children exist there many stores that sell ice cream
    (There exist many stores that sell ice cream to children)
    (Subject relativized, indirect object extracted)

(40) *Børn findes der mange forretningar der sälger is til.*
    children exist there many stores that sell ice cream to
    (There exist many stores that sell ice cream to children)
    (Subject relativized, indirect object extracted without Pied Piping)

(41) *Den forretning findes der mange slags is som sälger til børn.*
    that store exist there many kinds ice cream that sell to children
    (There exist many kinds of ice cream that that store sells to children)
    (Direct object relativized, subject extracted)
The first three sentences indicate that, when the subject is relativized, either the direct or indirect object can be extracted and that Pied Piping is preferable when possible. The next four sentences show that, of all the other options, the case where the direct object is relativized and the indirect object extracted is the best. I believe that this distribution of facts is related to a whole group of facts which includes the Fixed Subject Constraint (Bresnan, 1972), and that this kind of constraint is different from the one that allows or prevents extraction in general. Therefore, when extraction out of a specific embedded sentence is mentioned, it is intended that at least one NP in that embedded sentence can be extracted. The conditions that bar the other NPs in that clause from being extracted will not be dealt with here, since they involve a discussion of the difference between the various NPs within the simple sentence; the topic of this dissertation does not necessitate such a discussion.

It is interesting to note that the English equivalents of the Danish knot sentences formed from relative clauses are more acceptable than sentences in which extraction has occurred out of regular relative clauses:

42 Shir

(42) *Til børnene findes der mange slags is som forretningen sälger.
  to the children exists there many kinds of ice cream
  that the store sells
  (There exist many kinds of ice cream that the store
  sells to the children)
  (Direct object relativized, indirect object extracted)

(43) *Forretningen findes der mange børn som sälger is til.
  the store exist there many children that sells ice
  cream to
  (There exist many children that the store sells
  ice cream to)
  (Indirect object relativized, subject extracted)

(44) *Is findes der mange børn som forretningen sälger til.
  ice cream exist there many children that the store
  sells to
  (There exist many children that the store sells ice
  cream to)
  (Indirect object relativized, direct object extracted)
Sentence (45) does not seem to be quite as bad as (46), which in turn is better than (47). As a matter of fact, the first two are quite comprehensible to most people, but the last is not. I shall return to the comparison of Danish and English in section B of Chapter II.

In this section I have described the factors involved in extraction out of Danish relative clauses. I have tried to show that they provide a strong case for the analysis of extraction presented here, since only this analysis as opposed to other proposed analyses of extraction, can account correctly for these facts.

B. Knot Sentences Formed out of Danish Embedded Questions

Danish embedded questions are very similar to English embedded questions. The hv-words -- hvem, hvad, hvor, hvordan and hvilken (hvilket) -- take the place of the English wh-words who(m), what, where, how and which, respectively. Whether is om; this also means if. The differences between Danish and English embedded questions lie in the extent to which extraction is possible and the insertion of der in subject position. The following is an example of an embedded question with der:

(48) Jeg ved ikke hvem der kommer.
    I know not who there comes
    (I don't know who is coming)

I have tried to argue that the relative pronoun der is inserted in subject position. If this der (in addition to the der which means there) is the same der as the one in relative clauses, we have further evidence that it must be inserted in subject position, since the COMP node is filled by the wh-words.4

I shall proceed to examine extraction out of Danish embedded questions. The possibility of extraction will again be shown to be defined by the condition on extraction presented in the Introduction. The following are some examples of knot sentences formed from embedded questions:

(49) Den mand spurgte han hende om hun virkelig troede paa.
    that man asked he her whether she really believed in
    (He asked her whether she really believed in that man)

(50) Ham ved jeg ikke hvem der kan lide.
    him know I not who there likes

(51) Ham ved jeg ikke hvem er.
    him know I not who is
    (I don't know who he is)
In order to define the dominance relations within embedded questions, a context test must be found which applies naturally to them, for the "which is a lie" test and the adverbial test are not appropriate. For embedded questions, the following quite parallel dominance test will be used:

(52) Otto: "S"
Francine: a. ~N
b. ~P

For examples:

(53) Otto: Bill wonders who he is going to marry.
Francine: a. He does not.
b. He isn't going to marry anyone.

The fact that (b) is a possible response is an indication that the embedded question of (50) can be considered to be dominant. This test, like all other dominance tests, correctly shows that simple sentences (in this case direct questions) are clearly dominant:

(54) Otto: Bill decided who he was going to marry.
Francine: a. He did not.
b. *He isn't going to marry anyone.

The unacceptability of (b) is an indication that the embedded question must be interpreted as being subordinate.

I would like to claim here that it is always true for Danish that extraction is possible out of the complements of those verbs which can be interpreted as being dominant according to the dominance test proposed in this section. The following are some further examples:

(55) Det brev spurgte hun ham om han havde skrevet.
that letter asked she him whether he had written
(She asked him whether he had written that letter)

(56) Ham var det en gaade hvem der ville tage sig af.
him was it a mystery who there would take care of him
(It was a mystery who would take care of him)
(57) Det brev had jeg forhørt mig om hvem der had skrevet.
that letter have I inquired about who there has written
(I have inquired who has written that letter)

(58) Det brev var det unklart hvem der havde skrevet.
that letter was it unclear who there had written
(It was unclear who had written that letter)

(59) Det brev vidste han ikke hvem der havde skrevet.
that letter knew he not who there had written

The verbs spørge, vaere en gaade, forhøre sig, vaere uklart, and ikke vide all give the same results as wonder in (53), the test example. The Danish equivalent of wonder whether (limited to first person subjects) is mon:

(60) Mon han kan lidt mig.
I wonder whether he likes me

(61) Hvem mon kan lidt mig.
who I wonder likes me

Just as in direct questions, extraction cannot occur out of mon sentences that do not take the form of embedded sentences:

(62) *Peter who likes?

(63) *Peter hvem mon kan lidt.
Peter who I wonder likes

The following sentences illustrate cases where the matrix verb does not take complements that can be interpreted as being dominant (as can decide in examples (55)). It is not difficult to set up test examples with the various verbs replacing decide in that example. The results will be the same for them all, and I shall omit writing out the tests for the sake of sparing the reader the tedium of reading them.) As expected, extraction is not possible in these cases:

(64) *Hende overbevidste Peter sig om hvem der kunne lidt.
her convinced Peter himself about who there liked
(Peter convinced himself about who liked her)

(65) *Hende bestemte Peter hvem der besøgte.
her decided Peter who there visited
(67) *Hende undrede Peter sig over hvem der kunne lide.
her was Peter surprised over who there liked
(Peter was surprised (at) who liked her)

(68) *Dem sagde Peter (til hende) hvad han havde givet.
them said Peter (to her) what he had given

A few cases of knot sentences have been found in the literature where the matrix verb is of the sort which takes only subordinate embedded questions; these are, therefore, cases which seem to be counterexamples to the condition on extraction proposed here.

(69) Nazisme ved man dog hvad er.
Nazism knows one after all what is
(One knows after all what Nazism is)

(70) ...saa tjener de penge, for dem ved de hvad er vaerd.
then earn they money for them know they what is worth
(t hey earn money for they know what it is worth)

These sentences are rather peculiar. They differ from regular embedded questions in a way somewhat parallel to the difference between rhetorical questions and regular direct questions: the whole sentence has some kind of contextual reference, which makes the matrix in a sense subordinate, as well as the embedded clause. (The presence of *dog* --- "after all" --- in the matrix of (69), which indicates that what is being said should be obvious, is an indication that this is the correct analysis.) Such peculiar usages will cause exceptional cases of extraction in some English examples as well, and I will return to a discussion of them in the next chapter.

There is one more factor which plays a role in the extraction out of embedded questions in Danish, and that is which question word is present in the embedded clause. The relevant discussion will be postponed until the next chapter, in which extraction out of English infinitival embedded questions is examined.

I have attempted to show that the condition on extraction proposed here correctly accounts for extraction out of Danish relative clauses and embedded questions. These cases of extraction would be classified as "exceptional" in most of the structural accounts of conditions on extraction. No other Danish complement types will be discussed, since a parallel discussion can be carried out for English. In order to simplify the discussion, this chapter has been limited only to the consideration of those facts from Danish which differ from English.
1In these examples topicalization is the only rule of extraction used. Examples where relativization or questioning had applied could have been constructed as well. For example:

_Hvad er der mange der kan lide?
What are there many that like
(There are many (people) who like X)

or:
_Jane bor i det hus som jeg kender en mand som har købt.
Jane lives in that house that I know a man that has bought
(Jane lives in that house [I know a man who has bought that house])

However, it is not the case that all examples lend themselves equally well to both questioning and relativization as well as topicalization. This question will be discussed further on in the chapter.

2The fact that extraction is not possible in English needs to be explained. I shall return to that issue in Chapter III, G).

3One other factor was found to play a role in defining this subset of Danish relative clauses. Extraction becomes somewhat worse when the subject of the sentence is a third-person pronoun:

a. *Fransk var de en lille skare der studerede ivrigt.
   French were they a little group that studied eagerly

b. *Det hus kender han en mand som har købt.
   that house knows he a man who has bought

c. *Her har hun en onkel der bor.
   here has she an uncle who lives

1. an actual conversation only a third-person pronoun is potentially ambiguous with respect to its reference (since first-person pronouns and second-person pronouns refer to the speaker and hearer respectively). It is clear that it is this ambiguity which causes the sentences to be less than acceptable, for neither proper names nor definite noun phrases make the extracted sentences less acceptable. I have no explanation for this fact at the moment.

4Der insertion would have to be an obligatory rule for embedded questions and could be written as an obligatory rule for relative clauses as well. *Som would be the realization of -wh for relative clauses. There would be a rule optionally deleting *som when the subject of the clause was relativized. Der insertion would be
written as an obligatory rule inserting *der* in empty subject positions. This rule would include the regular *there*-insertion rule. The rule would have to be cyclical to avoid insertions of *der* in the place of extracted subjects.

5 It is interesting to note that (48) is a counterexample to the fixed subject constraint posited by Bresnan (1972). This constraint does hold in general for Danish, as the following example illustrates:

- a. *Hvem tror du at kommer?*
  who think you that is coming

- b. *Hvem tror du kommer?*
  who think you is coming

The following examples strengthen the argument by Chomsky that the constraint must be stated on the surface and cannot be considered to be a condition on the extraction rule:

- c. *Hvem tror du der kommer?*
  who think you there is coming

- d. *Hvem tror du at der kommer?*
  who think you that there is coming

According to the fixed subject constraint, the last sentence should be bad, since the extraction of the subject occurs across the complementizer. However, it is acceptable due to the insertion of *der* in subject position. Example (51) and the additional examples that follow will still remain counterexamples to the surface formulation of the condition:

- e. *Ham ved jeg ikke hvor er.*
  him know I not where is

- f. *Det ved jeg ikke hvad vil sige.*
  that know I not what means

- g. *En stemme jeg ikke ved hvor kom fra...*
  a voice I not know where comes from...

(These examples are taken from the various Danish grammars listed in the bibliography.) This set of examples which violate the fixed subject constraint are characterized by the fact that the verb in the embedded sentence is in most cases to be, to mean, or the like. It is possible that the subjects of such verbs do not have all the properties of semantic subjects and that the fixed subject constraint should be formulated to apply only to those subjects that do.

As with the knot sentences formed out of Danish relative clauses, it is the case with those formed out of embedded questions that in
all instances but the ones just mentioned the subject of the embedded clause is the questioned element and the direct object is the one extracted. I would reiterate that this is the kind of phenomenon that I believe to be independent of the general condition on extraction and hence will not deal with here.

6 It does not make sense to comment on an embedded question to the effect that it is a lie, nor is it possible to qualify the embedded question with adverbs of the sort relevant to this test. This is not due to the fact that embedded questions are subordinate in general, but rather because they are questions. Obviously simple sentences must always be dominant -- and hence direct questions are too -- but the tests are not appropriate to questions:

a. Bill asked: "Who did it?"

* Which is a lie -- someone didn't.

b. *Who certainly did it?

7 The division made by this test between the various verbs that take embedded questions classifies the verbs into two groups quite similar to those groups defined by Permesly (1973). The complements of her nonfactives (ask, wonder, be a mystery, inquire, be unclear) can all be interpreted as being dominant. However, the complements of the wh-factives and the complements of regular factive verbs cannot be thus interpreted, as in the case of decide. Not know as distinct from know is an exception to this parallel:

Otto: Bill doesn't know who he is going to marry.

Francine: a. He does know.

b. He isn't going to marry anyone.

Not know, as well as know, both come under the rubric of "factive" in Permesly's classification. It is therefore not clear that sub-ordi nance is related to nonfactivity as one would expect; it might also be that the extension of factivity to cover embedded questions made by Permesly is not the one relevant to dominance.