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Abbreviations used throughout this thesis:\footnote{Of course, the terminology will be introduced firstly, but for convenience it might be helpful to have a look-up list to avoid confusion about all those abbreviations}:

- $p$: a proposition
- $\text{not-}p$: the complement of the proposition $p$
- $\text{y/n-question}$: yes-no-question
- $\text{NPI}$: negative polarity item
- $\text{PPI}$: positive polarity item
- $\text{PPPI}$: positive proposition presupposing item
- $\text{NPPI}$: negative proposition presupposing item
- $\text{PPQ}$: positive polar question
- $\text{PNQ}$: preposed negation question
- $\text{B&G}$: Buering and Gunlogson (2000)
- $\text{R&H}$: Romero and Han (2004)
- $\text{NPQ}$: Negative Polar Question
- $\text{ONPQ}$: Outer Negation Polar Question
- $\text{INPQ}$: Inner Negation Polar Question
0. Introduction

The aim of this thesis is to examine the complexities underlying (negated) yes/no-questions in English and in German. There is a general agreement that a semantic theory of questions needs to account for the diversity which exists between the different subtypes of polar questions. It is thought that it is not sufficient to assume the same meaning for both positive and negative polar questions. The semantic theory of questions (Groenendijk & Stokhof (1984), Hamblin (1973)), however, predicts all y/n-questions to denote the set of possible answers \{that \( p \), that not-\( p \}\). The partition into possible answers is derived by means of the question operator \( Q \). The question operator \( Q \) has the widest scope of all operators occurring within the denotation of a question and thus always scopes over the negation. For instance, the examples in 1) and 2) both have the denotation in 3).

1) Is Jane coming?
2) Is Jane not coming?
3) Denotation for 1) and 2): \{that Jane is coming, that Jane is not coming\}

There is no semantic difference between the negation marker \( n't \) as in 5) and the negation marker \( not \) of 2). Both types of negation are analyzed as taking a proposition and yielding its complement. Thus, no matter whether a y/n-question is positive or whether it contains the preposed negation \( n't \) or whether it contains \( not \) (4), it receives the same denotation.

4) \([ [not] ] = [ [n't] ] = \lambda p <s ,t >. \neg p\)
5) Isn’t Jane coming?

This does, however, not comply with the intuitions in the literature about polar questions. By investigation, it turns out that positive questions differ from negative questions and that there is even some distinction within the category of negative polar questions.

There are three recent approaches investigating polar questions. Buering & Gunlogson (2000) – B&G – define different types of polar questions in terms of the contexts, which a certain polar question requires in order to be felicitous. Romero & Han (2002, 2004) – R&H – provide a formal account of the different types of y/n-question by means of introducing a new

\(^2\) \( p \) stands for the proposition that the question puts to debate; \( not-p \) stands for the complement of the proposition that the question puts to debate.

\(^3\) From R&H (2004), p. 617
operator into the semantics and by assuming several pragmatic principles to apply. Van Rooy and Safarova (2003) – vR&S – provide a decision theoretic approach in order to explain and account for the different appearances of polar questions.

According to their intuitions about typology, presence of presupposition or implicature and contextual requirements of each type of y/n-question, each approach suggests a way to cope with and account for the differences. Nevertheless, these approaches do neither agree in terms of the typology of polar questions, nor in terms of what the different types of polar questions convey, nor regarding the licensing contexts of polar questions.

Ladd (1981) had suggested that negated polar questions are ambiguous between an inner and outer negation reading. A y/n-question with an inner negation questions the negative proposition while a y/n-question with an outer negation questions the positive proposition. B&G took up this suggestion and introduced a typology of polar questions, which comprises positive (PPQ) and negative polar questions (NPQ) with the negative polar questions being subdivided into INPQs (Inner Negation Polar Questions) and ONPQs (Outer Negation Polar Questions). B&G assume all negative polar questions to convey an implication that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition. R&H further expanded the typology and restricted the ambiguity to preposed negation questions such as 6) and 7).

6) Isn't Jane coming too?
7) Isn't Jane coming either?
8) Is Jane not coming?

Their typology of negated polar questions includes NI-questions such as 7) (≈ INPQs), PI-questions such as 6) (≈ ONPQs) and non-preposed negation questions such as 8). Moreover, they assume NI-questions and PI-questions to contribute an implicature, which says that the speaker has the positive belief that e.g. Jane is coming; it is argued that non-preposed negation questions do not convey a speaker’s belief. Finally, vR&S argue that the assumption of an ambiguity pertaining to polar questions should be abolished. Besides, they assume all negated polar questions to presuppose a positive speaker’s belief.

In this thesis, I will examine the different approaches and will point out their shortcomings.

---

4 R&H call the presupposition that the asking person has a positive belief about p an implicature, B&G and implication. I will, however, follow vR&S, who rather speak of the question as presupposing a positive speaker’s belief. For investigation of the presupposition of polar questions consult vR&S. In those parts of the thesis, in which R&H’s approach is discussed, I will stick to their terminology.
I conducted experiments in order to find out more about the typology and meaning of y/n-questions, and to investigate the influence the context might have on their occurrence. Based upon the findings obtained by the experiments, the disagreement between the different approaches will be resolved and the hitherto theory will be perpetuated. The experimental results will indicate that there are two different kinds of negation within y/n-questions. I will suggest that the differentiation of the different types of polar questions takes place at a presuppositional level and thus the hitherto semantics can remain as supplied before.

This thesis is organized in two parts. The first part consists of the theoretical section and the second part is about the empirical investigation of the theoretical issues. The first chapter of the theoretical section deals with the contextual dependencies of polar questions, chapter 2 looks at the different approaches in terms of their attitude towards attributing the speaker a positive belief and chapter 3 examines the different views regarding the presence of an ambiguity of negated polar questions. Chapter 4 considers German polar questions under the same leading points, under which the literature inspects polar questions of English. Finally, in chapters 1 and 2 of the experimental section, I will describe the experimental design of the studies investigating English and German polar question. The aim of chapters 1 and 2 is to present and discuss the results and their implications. At the end of this thesis you will find a chapter concluding and providing an outlook. The material used for the experiments is added as an appendix.
1. Contextual Factors

It is not possible to predict from a certain context what kind of y/n-question will follow. The only point which can be stated according to B&G, is that some contexts cause certain questions to be infelicitous. R&H predict the interplay of the previous belief of the speaker and the preceding context (e.g. a statement of the addressee) to trigger a certain question type. Both, R&H and B&G disregard that y/n-questions can be used not only to acquire information but also to follow other goals (vR&S, 2003) and thus do not allow for questions which occur without a special context.

In this chapter, I will present the findings of B&G and R&H resulting from their investigation concerning the contextual requirements of different polar questions and will identify the points at which the opinions diverge. I will argue that an approach for explaining and accounting for different subtypes of y/n-questions cannot merely rely on that polar question occur in a definite set of definable contexts but needs more flexible means.

1.1. Contextual Evidence

B&G define for each question type the unique requirements on its context. The conditions on use of certain questions do not involve a possible previous belief of the speaker. B&G investigate their polar questions by means of what they term as contextual evidence. Contextual evidence is defined as “Evidence that has just become mutually available to the participants in the current discourse situation”\(^5\). Only knowledge which the speaker has currently received falls under this definition. There are three different kinds of contextual evidence: providing evidence for a proposition p (= positively biased), providing evidence against a proposition p (= negatively biased) or being neutral in nature. Neutral context means either that the situation in which the question is posed does not have any impact on the knowledge about p, or that the conversation which only currently took place does not entail any evidence for or against p. The notion neutral does not veto possible previous knowledge or beliefs of the speaker pertaining to the truth of p. B&G assume that common ground knowledge, generally known principles or privately acquired knowledge do not belong to the definition of context.

---

\(^5\) on p.7 of B&G (2000)
In order to come up with felicity conditions for the different types of questions, B&G incorporate all three assumed types of y/n-questions into a neutral context, a context conveying evidence for p and a context providing evidence against p, respectively. B&G find that every one of their question-types gives rise to a different pattern of licensing contexts. The content as well as the polarity of the evidence hereby influence the question choice.

Considering PPQs, what B&G find is that this type is permitted within a context which provides either evidence for p or which is of neutral nature. By no means a PPQ is licensed in a context which provides evidence against p. For instance, a question like 9) appears to be infelicitous in a context where a person comes into a room with no windows, wearing a dripping rain coat - this is regarded as evidence against p. Whereas, a question like 10) appears to be appropriate because the current situation constitutes evidence for rain.

9) Is it sunny?
10) Is it raining?

In contrast to PPQs, INPQs are only possible in a context which holds compelling evidence against p. Neither a neutral context nor a positively biased context is able to make an INPQ felicitous. For instance, if one has no indicator for that there is a vegetarian restaurant, or if there is an indicator for that there is a vegetarian restaurant, it seems inapt to ask 11).

11) Is there no vegetarian Restaurant around here?

The investigation of ONPQs yields as a result that they can occur in neutral contexts and in contexts, which provide evidence against p. In contrast to INPQs, ONPQs are additionally licensed in neutral contexts.

Summarizing, the pattern which B&G obtain is the following:

- ONPQs occur in neutral and negatively biased contexts
- INPQs occur in negatively biased contexts
- PPQs occur in positively biased contexts

B&G take these different felicity conditions as evidence for that the different types of polar question have meanings distinct from one other.
INPQs and ONPQs both are licensed in negatively biased contexts. Even though it is not B&G’s goal to predict when a speaker chooses a certain type of polar question, the question arises on which factor the choice between ONPQs and INPQs depends if both types are felicitous in a context with negative evidence. There is a possible way of distinguishing their circumstances of occurrence. Although B&G do not assume the speaker’s belief to play a central role in the choice of question, they claim that the implication of ONPQs is stronger than the implication of INPQs. *Stronger implication* means in this case that the speaker has concrete reasons to belief p. If the speaker’s belief is merely based upon generally adopted opinions, INPQs are used, and the implication is weaker than the implication derived from the speaker’s own experience or knowledge in case of ONPQs. The assumption regarding p is not based upon privately acquired knowledge if a speaker uses an INPQ. If the speaker uses an ONPQ, she needs to have good reason to assume p. Since this is the only difference within B&G’s approach, which might influence the choice, the strength of the implication might be said to be the decisive factor in terms of whether the speaker chooses an INPQ or an ONPQ.

- The question choice depends on the content and on the bias of the current context
- It is not previous belief or knowledge, which is responsible for the emergence of a certain type of question
- A context of a certain bias may not predict a certain question type; different felicity conditions for different question types indicate the importance to account for the diversity

1.2. The Interaction Speaker/Addressee

R&H clearly differentiate between possible previous beliefs of the speaker and the circumstances of the current discourse situation. Contrary to B&G, the interaction of both is responsible for the appearance of a certain question type.

R&H are of the opinion that *contextual evidence* is a possible reason for uttering a certain kind of y/n-question. There might, however, also be other reasons which can determine whether a speaker asks for p or whether she asks for not-p\(^\text{11}\). Like B&G, R&H place their y/n-questions in certain contexts and examine which question is felicitous in which scenario. R&H take into account the current discourse situation as well as the speaker’s previous assumptions. On the one hand, they vary their contexts in terms of whether a previous belief that p is true is present or not. On the other hand, the current

\(^{11}\) Compare to footnote 6 of R&H (2004)
discourse situation differs in terms of whether it triggers an inquiry questioning p or an inquiry questioning not-p. The current discourse situation is usually what a statement of the addressee implied. Examples are given in 12) and 13).

12) S: “Ok, now that Stephan has come, we are all here. Let’s go!”
   a. Isn’t Jane coming too?
13) S: “Pat is not coming. So we don’t have any phonologists in the program.”
   a. Isn’t Jane coming either?

R&H’s work focuses mainly on preposed negation questions although they do not disregard positive and non-preposed negation questions. Regarding preposed negation y/n-questions as opposed to non-preposed negation y/n-questions, R&H claim that these y/n-questions can only be used if the speaker had a previous belief that the positive proposition is true. The speaker’s belief is thus the decisive factor for whether the negation is preposed or not. Notice, however, that if a speaker’s belief in the truth of the positive proposition is present, the negation does not necessarily have to be preposed. There are conceivable reasons for a speaker to conceal her belief by not using the question type which reveals her belief.

R&H argue that preposed negation questions are either prompted by contradiction scenarios or by suggestion contexts. Contradiction scenarios denote situations in which the speaker’s belief disaccords with the addressee’s implied proposition. Suggestion scenarios denote situations where the speaker uses a preposed negation y/n-question in order to suggest p. It is assumed that the addressee does not have an assumption about what might be an answer to the question at issue. Otherwise, there would be no need to propose an answer. Moreover, the speaker herself is not entirely sure about her own belief that p is a possible answer and thus suggests p by means of a question. While ONPQs can be used in order to suggest p and are appropriate in contradiction scenarios, INPQs are merely felicitous in contradiction scenarios and cannot be used in order to suggest not-p.

---

12 R&H term a context non-biased if the speaker does not have any assumptions about whether p is true or whether it is false. R&H use the term bias in order to express that a certain question conveys a belief of the speaker just as they use the term implicature. On the other hand, B&G use the term negative bias in order to indicate that the current context provides counterevidence and the term positive bias in order to indicate that the current context provides evidence for the truth of p. I will follow B&G in their usage of the term bias.
R&H do not disambiguate INPQs and ONPQs regarding contextual occurrence. It is not clear when a speaker uses which type of question in the situation of contradiction. The ambiguity within contradiction contexts is not disambiguated explicitly by, for instance, different conditions on the current situation. The scenarios in which R&H place their INPQs differ from the scenarios, in which they place their ONPQs in terms of one feature. To observe the difference, consider the counterevidence in 12) in contrast to the counterevidence in 13). 12) can denote counterevidence for that somebody else, let us say Jane, is coming, since the speaker implies that the group does not have to wait for anybody else. A positive statement expresses the counterevidence and thus a question with *too* can be posed. Turning to 13), the counterevidence for phonologist Jane’s coming is expressed by a negative statement, namely that there is no phonologist and thus, a question with *either* can be posed. *Too* presupposes a positive proposition and *either* presupposes a negative proposition and thus, in the context of 12), an ONPQ is felicitous while in the context of 13), an INPQ would be the question chosen. R&H assume the items *too* and *either* to disambiguate the reading of a preposed negation y/n-question.

Therefore, within R&H’s approach, different question types –INPQs and ONPQs - may both occur in a context providing evidence against p. The items which disambiguate the questions require a distinctive context so that the occurrence of a certain question type can be predicted by the fulfillment of the requirements of the item in the context.

In sum, R&H provide some feature to distinguish the different types of y/n-questions by means of their contexts. The interplay of the speaker’s belief and the addressee’s utterance is responsible for a preposed negation question. If the speaker’s conversational state does not include a positive belief about p, then either a positive or a non-preposed negation y/n-question is uttered; if it does include the positive belief about p, both a preposed and a non-preposed negation question might be posed. Concluding, it is not possible to unambiguously predict a certain question type by its context.

- In R&H’s approach, the speaker’s belief plays a central role for the occurrence of preposed negation questions
- Preposed negation questions occur in conflict or in suggestion scenarios
- The presupposition of *either* and *too* distinguishes the contexts for ONPQs and INPQs
1.3. Context Dependency

In vR&S (2003) it is argued against the theory based on contextual requirements. Y/n-questions do not necessarily have to occur in certain contexts because questions are not only used with the goal to obtain information. VR&S point out that the occurrence of y/n-questions is not restricted to certain contexts and thus, it is not sufficient to account for the difference between question types merely by means of contextual restrictions. Decision theory allows them to explain the occurrence of different types of polar questions by means of certain functions modeling the belief/goal-state of the speaker in a context-independent way. The occurrence of a certain question type is defined by the mental state of the speaker, which gives rise to this type of question.

B&G and R&H’s approach of explaining the occurrence of certain types of y/n-questions is dependent on contextual factors. R&H’s reasoning for the presence of the implicature that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition, their reasoning for the polarity of the implicature and for the ambiguity of preposed negation questions, rely on the factors of conflict and suggestion scenarios\(^{13}\). R&H’s approach thus seems to limit the occurrence of preposed negation y/n-questions to scenarios of conflict or suggestion. B&G’s reasoning for that all of their identified subtypes of polar questions should receive a different meaning, is also based upon the assumption that polar questions require certain contexts.

It is not only conflicting situations or suggestion scenarios where it is possible to pose a negated y/n-question, which presupposes a speaker’s belief. Polar questions might even occur without a context. VR&S offer examples of cases where polar questions occur without a conversational context. They argue that during e.g. medical examinations the doctor might ask negated questions in order to be able to make a diagnosis and not because of a certain contextual condition. The doctor might ask e.g. *Can you not breathe properly?* With the goal to find out what is wrong with the patient.

Although they provide example questions containing a non-preposed negation, they do not offer questions with preposed negation. This is consistent with their assumption that negated polar questions do not need to be subdivided further, and makes it superfluous to differentiate between preposed and non-preposed negation questions in terms of their examples.

\(^{13}\) It is, however, beyond the scope of this thesis to explore all of these reasonings more closely. But the reader is invited to take a look at R&H (2004), especially at the section explaining the polarity of the implicature.
It remains to be demonstrated that preposed negation questions might be used without a certain context. VR&S mention interviews or situations in which the speaker wants to mingle in order to demonstrate that y/n-questions are not necessarily dependent on contextual conditions. This kind of situation might lead to a question conveying a speaker’s belief. For instance, during an interview, the interviewer might ask a preposed negation y/n-question because she imagines p to be true although she does not know the interviewee well and thus does not have an explicit belief about the interviewee. The interviewee does neither have to show a sign for that she has a different opinion nor that she wants to obtain a suggestion nor that she does not have an answer to p. In a SPIEGEL\(^6\) interview, the sheik of Dubai has been asked 14). 15) gives the English translation of 14):

14) Ist es nicht schwierig den eigenen Neffen zum Chef zu haben?
   Is it not difficult the own nephew as a Boss to have?
15) Isn’t it difficult to have your nephew as your boss?

Clearly, an implication is present that the interviewer imagined it to be difficult to have the own nephew as your boss. The question contains a preposed negation. Notice that B&G’s notion of different implications in terms of ONPQs and INPQs can best describe what the question in 14) conveys: An assumption based on generally assumed principles - for instance, that humans have problems to accept somebody as their boss if the person is younger or that the distribution of power is a problematic issue in families. Although B&G assume INPQs to convey this kind of implication, in this case, the question appears to be a question about p and not about not-p, and should thus be termed as ONPQ.

Neither B&G nor R&H take into account the occurrence of a y/n-question like 14). Although such a question might occur in a neutral context in B&G (2000), in this interview situation there was not really a context which triggered the question. A neutral context is rather defined as that there is a context which does not provide evidence for or against p, and not as a context not being present at all. The question rather comes out of the blue and is thus not licensed by B&G.

Furthermore, since R&H assume ONPQs to be restricted to conflict or suggestion scenarios, the occurrence of the question cannot be explained by their account. Even though one could

\(^6\) DER SPIEGEL (12/2006) - 20.03.2006
argue that the interviewer politely wants to suggest that *it is difficult to have your own nephew as your boss* by means of her question, the circumstances of the question do not correspond with R&H’s definition of a suggestion scenario.

As another example for the occurrence of a polar question not depending on its context, imagine a situation where the speaker intends to mingle with a person she hardly knows. She might want to get a conversation going, might have heard something about the person before, and uses this assumption to make contact. The person does not have to provide counterevidence in order for the speaker to be able to ask a preposed negation question. The speaker might ask questions like *Isn’t it your brother who recently won ...?* or even *Isn’t the weather awesome today?* without the intention to suggest and without the necessity that the person of interest had provided any evidence. The speaker does not even have to be interested in the answer – her goal is rather to make conversation. In this case there would not even be a need for a special kind of evidence.

Neither B&G’s nor R&H’s approach allow for negated y/n-question, which occur without a specific context or which were prompted by a certain kind of evidence.

By contrast, vR&S’s approach allows for all kinds of questions because they describe them by means of the belief/desire state of the speaker and the utility value of a certain type of question and do not limit the use of y/n-questions to certain conversational situations. They can thus account for that a y/n-question might be asked not just for informational purposes but also because of e.g. the goal to start a conversation. Negated y/n-questions in interview situations can be explained by that the agents probability function P, which models the belief of the speaker, yields a higher value for the positive proposition. The value of information, sometimes also referred to as surprisal value, is higher for the negative proposition and thus the negation within the question is explained.

VR&S account for the positive belief of the speaker by \( P(\neg p) < P(p) \). That is, the probability is higher that the positive proposition is true than that the negative proposition is true. The information value is used to allow for the occurrence of the negation in the question. The information value \( \text{inf} \) receives a lower value in case of questioning the positive proposition: \( \text{inf}(\neg p) > \text{inf}(p) \). VR&S explain the occurrence of ONPQs in this manner. INPQs receive a special treatment, which will be explained below.
Concluding, R&H and B&G limit y/n-questions to certain contexts. They both disregard that emergence of y/n-questions is not restricted to certain scenarios. VR&S provide an account, which solves this problem by presenting the possibility to consider polar questions not in terms of their contexts but in terms of their utility values on the pragmatic level.

- VR&S provide a context-independent approach by means of values of probability and informativity
- The different occurrences of polar questions cannot exclusively be described by their contextual requirements

Most important points of chapter 1

- R&H take into account the speaker’s conversational state and the evidence from the current context
- B&G base their definition of different subtypes of polar questions merely on the contextual evidence
- The two approaches disagree in that R&H find that the speaker’s belief has an effect on the question choice while B&G view the speaker’s belief as an implication of the question but do not incorporate it in their felicity conditions
- The limitation of the occurrence of polar questions to certain contexts turns out not to suffice

2. Presupposition/Implicature

The overall goal of this chapter is to explore how the different approaches explain the speaker’s belief which is conveyed by preposed negation y/n-questions.

This chapter firstly investigates the relationship of presuppositions and implicatures regarding preposed negation questions and serves the purpose of disambiguating these terms. The next two subchapters present R&H’s explanation for the semantic difference between preposed negation questions and non-preposed negation questions. The fourth subchapter discusses VR&S’s approach to explain the presence of a presupposition of the positive speaker’s belief. Finally, the fifth subchapter challenges some assumptions of the previous sections.

   2.1. Presupposition versus Implicature

Y/n-questions containing a preposed negation convey to the hearer that the speaker believes the positive proposition of the question to be true. The question communicates more than what it actually denotes on a strictly semantic level. This is in accord with the definition of the
term implicature: “Something that is implied by a speaker uttering a sentence, without being part of the truth-conditional content of that sentence.”

It holds that if a speaker uses a preposed negation y/n-question, it is implied that she believes in the truth of p. That is, to hear a y/n-question which includes a preposed negation lets the hearer infer that the speaker believes in p, and the question itself carries the implication or implicature that the speaker believes in p. Furthermore, the utterance of such a question presupposes that the speaker believes or had believed in the truth of p. This is the felicity condition for the posing of such a question. R&H and B&G notice that preposed negation questions presuppose that the speaker must have believed in the truth of the positive proposition but do not fully consider the consequences. In R&H (2004), they propose the Principle of Economy, which indicates that the choice to use a preposed negation question presupposes a reason to do so. They refer to the speaker’s belief as implicature of the question. All the same, R&H explain the presence of the implicature in preposed negation questions by means of this principle. Notice that they account for the question’s implication by means of the question’s presupposition. The presupposition and the implicature are, however, the two sides of one coin: looking at the same thing from a different angle. The presupposition is the felicity condition of the question and states that a certain requirement must be satisfied. The implicature tells the hearer that the content of the presupposition (that the speaker believes in the truth of p) holds – otherwise the questions would not be posed.

Turning to B&G, they speak of an implication carried most notably by ONPQs. They pose felicity conditions on the occurrence of y/n-questions. What felicity conditions eventually do is to state that a certain question type presupposes a condition. In B&G (2000), the speaker’s belief is not included in the felicity conditions. Hence, it appears that B&G merely look at what the question implies. Having an implication, however, means that a presupposition needs to be fulfilled before the question is posed. That is, the speaker must believe in the truth of p. The belief-state of the speaker needs to be considered also in order to account for a question’s felicity. VR&S consider the belief-state of the speaker and use it in order to account for the positive belief, which is conveyed by a preposed negation question. A question conveying a positive

---
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speaker’s belief demands, according to vR&S, the probability assumed by the speaker to be higher for the positive proposition to be true than for the negative proposition. They catch that the posing of a negated question presupposes the speaker to believe that p is likely to be true.

If one accounts for the demands of a question, it is inherent that the occurrence of the question implies that the demands of the question must have been fulfilled because the speaker chose to ask it. Thus, the implication arises. It is, however, the presupposition which was there first. After it was fulfilled, the question could be posed and imply that its presupposition was satisfied. The implication is caused by assuming that speakers usually adhere to underlying pragmatic principles – that is, in this case to only pose a preposed negation question if the speaker satisfies the question’s presupposition.

Concluding, it is important to distinguish clearly between presupposition and implicature but also to be aware that they present the same thing from different perspectives. I will use the notion presupposition to denote the question’s demand but I will use the notion implicature in when presenting R&H’s and B&G’s assumptions in order to not adulterate what they want to express.

- The implicature of the speaker’s belief denotes what the hearer of the question infers
- The presupposition of the speaker’s belief denotes what the question demands in order to be felicitous
- The presence of the implicature implies that the presupposition has been fulfilled

2.2. A New Semantic Operator
A speaker will only choose to utter a preposed negation y/n-question if she believes in the truth of the positive proposition. That is, a preposed negation y/n-question presupposes a positive previous belief of the speaker. The utterance of a non-preposed negation question does not underlie certain requirements. R&H assume that the implicature, which conveys that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition, is connected to the preposing of the negation. In non-preposed negation y/n-questions, an implicature can be derived, for instance, from special focus marking, from addition of the word really or from certain

---

8 VR&S assume the following to apply not only to preposed negation questions but also to all negated y/n-questions which do not contain a focused negation like NOT.
intonational rising curves. It is assumed that without special markings, y/n-questions with non-preposed negation, do not carry an epistemic implicature.

In the following, it will be demonstrated how R&H explain the difference between preposed negation questions and non-preposed negation questions. They find it surprising that preposed negation questions convey a speaker’s belief while non-preposed negation questions contain the same ingredients (Q, negation) and do not contribute an implicature that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition. R&H suggest inserting a new operator into the semantics of preposed negation questions. By means of a new operator it becomes possible to account for the difference between preposed negation questions and non-preposed negation questions at a semantic level.

The operator is termed Verum operator, derived from Hoehle’s Verum focus (Hoehle, 1992). R&H put forward that Verum is present in y/n-questions which convey a speaker’s belief. This includes questions containing a preposed negation, a negation carrying focus or a focused auxiliary. Furthermore, R&H motivate the existence of Verum by revealing it and by finding a visible analog: according to R&H, y/n-questions with really also convey a speaker’s belief while demonstrating visibly where the implicature is coming from. The same question without really does not have the implication of a speaker’s belief (17 and 19).

16) Does John really not drink? Implicature that the speaker believes John to drink
17) Does John not drink? No implicature
18) Does John really drink? Implicature that the speaker believes John not to drink
19) Does John drink? No implicature
20) Doesn’t John drink? Implicature that the speaker believes John to drink

According to R&H, the addition of really implies the speaker’s belief that not-p is true when used in positive y/n-questions like 18). Whereas, for negated questions like 17), really adds a belief toward the positive proposition (16). That is, 16) has a feeling of conflict, where the speaker had been of the opinion that John would drink, then got some counterevidence and now wants to ensure the implication of the counterevidence.

R&H argue that preposing the negation brings about the same effect, which is caused by adding really to a y/n-question including a non-preposed negation. Preposed negation y/n-questions and y/n-questions with a non-preposed negation and really both presuppose a previous positive belief of the speaker. Because of this analogy of the two morpho-
syntactically different y/n-questions, R&H suggest to apply to both what the addition of really reveals: The question is about the certainty-degree of the addressee pertaining to the proposition in question. Hence, what the speaker implicitly asks in 16) is: Are you sure, that John does not drink? This intuition is based upon what we can observe in positive declaratives such as 21).

21) John does really drink.

⇒ The speaker is sure, that John drinks and wants p to be added to the common ground

It becomes noticeable that by uttering this sentence, the speaker wants to demonstrate his certainty of that the proposition should be added to the common ground (CG)\(^9\). Thus, a question containing really should question the certainty-degree in terms of a certain proposition. Because a y/n-question with really asks about the certainty degree of the dialog partner and because both – negated y/n-questions with really and preposed negation questions – carry an implicature, R&H assume preposed negation questions also to question the certainty degree. Consequently, Verum receives a meaning which is equated with what really inserts into a y/n-question, as (1) below states. Verum is supposed to be the distinctive semantic feature between preposed negation questions and non-preposed negation questions. While Verum is present in preposed negation questions, it is absent in non-preposed negation questions. What really adds to a positive proposition is stated in (2).

(1) \[[\text{VERUM}_i]\]_{g^\xi} = \[[\text{really}_i]\]_{g^\xi} = \[[\text{be sure}]][[i]]_{g^\xi}\lambda p<s,t>\lambda w. \forall w' \in Epi_s(w) [\forall w' \in Conv_{s'}(w')p(w') = 1] = \text{FOR-SURE-CG}.\(^{10}\)

(2) \text{VERUM } p: \text{The speaker is sure that (VERUM) } p \text{ should be added to the CG}

(3) Q \text{ VERUM } p: \text{Should } p \text{ be added to the CG?}

(4) Q \text{ VERUM } p = \{\text{for-sure-that-}p, \text{ not-for-sure-that-}p\}

If we assume a positive sentence with really to denote (2), then a positive y/n-question containing really consequently represents an inquiry about whether the speaker is sure that p

---

\(^9\) Adding p to the CG means that from now on all interlocutors take p for granted and that the matter will not be discussed again as long as no new specifications pertaining the issue emerge.

\(^{10}\) This definition comes from R&H (2004), p. 627
should be added to the common ground (see (3)). The question in (3) yields the set of possible answers in (4).

The addition of Verum to the semantics of y/n-questions which convey an implicature yields a denotation of these question types, which differs from the denotation of pure positive or pure negative y/n-questions. In order to derive the desired denotation, R&H consult Groenendijk and Stokhof (1984). According to them, the meaning of a y/n-question is a partition on the possible propositions in CG: either the proposition added to CG equals p or the proposition added equals not-p. Being asked whether one is sure about p, the reply might either be that the person asked is sure, or that she is not sure (see (4) above). Hence, according to R&H, Q Verum p results in an unbalanced partition of the question’s denotation: On the one hand, it is well-defined what it means to be sure that not-p is true and that p is true, respectively. On the other hand, the question arises what it means not to be sure. The different degrees to which a speaker might not be sure about p/not-p appear to be a spectrum of what it might connote to not be sure (maybe, possibly, probably etc.). Therefore, the partition is said to be unbalanced. By contrast, a question without preposed-negation yields a balanced partition: either p or not-p.

Summarizing, the assumption of Verum gives R&H the possibility to allow for the difference between preposed negation questions and non-preposed negation questions on a formal semantic level.

- A new operator Verum is stipulated and inserted into the semantics of preposed negation questions
- The operator causes the semantic denotation of preposed negation questions to be different from the denotation of non-preposed negation questions

2.3. A New Pragmatic Principle

In order to explain the presence of the implicature in preposed negation in contrast to non-preposed negation questions, R&H suggest an additional pragmatic principle.

While normal y/n-questions (positive and non-preposed negation) entail the intention of the speaker to either add p or not-p to the common ground, preposed negation y/n-questions rather have a meta-conversational aim. These questions want to scrutinize the conversational move to adjoin p or not-p to CG. The licensing of such an uneconomical step underlies
special constraints\textsuperscript{11}. An interlocutor needs to have a reason to choose a meta-conversational step. In order to allow for the need of licensing, R&H propose the Principle of Economy\textsuperscript{12}. A licenser may for instance be an epistemic conflict which requires resolution.

\begin{equation*}
\text{Principle of Economy:}
\text{Do not use a meta-conversational move unless necessary (to resolve epistemic conflict or to ensure quality).}
\end{equation*}

By means of this principle, R&H derive the presence of the implicature in y/n-questions with preposed negation as follows:

An unbalanced partition and the implicature are attributes of a y/n-question with preposed negation or with \textit{really}. Furthermore, the unbalanced partition, which indicates that the question aims for a meta-conversational move, is motivated in terms of pragmatics if the speaker is in a situation of epistemic conflict, and thus has a reason to choose the meta-conversational step: Firstly, in case of preposed negation y/n-questions like 22), the speaker believed in \( p \). Then the dialog partner made some statement, which implies the falsity of \( p \).

\begin{enumerate}
\item \text{Isn't Jane coming?}
\end{enumerate}

Therefore, the speaker is torn between his own believe and the addressee’s indication and wants to resolve this conflict by posing a y/n-question with preposed negation or with \textit{really}. The implicature is present in preposed negation y/n-questions because the past belief of the speaker constitutes an essential condition for the epistemic conflict to arise. The conflict is in turn the licenser for the meta-conversational step which expresses itself in an unbalanced partition and which is taken when posing a preposed negation y/n-question.

In suggestion scenarios, the presence of the implicature is explained as follows. The conversational relation between the speaker and the addressee is such that the speaker assumes that her dialog partner does not have an answer to some question \( r \) and believes \( p \) to be a possible answer to \( r \). Therefore, the speaker has reason to take on the uneconomic issue

\begin{itemize}
\item \text{uneconomical'}, because there is no reason to choose an unbalanced partition if one can also choose the balanced one, which gives rise to an unambiguous answer; after all, one side of the partition incorporates a whole spectrum of possible answers.
\item \text{p. 629 of R&H (2004)}
\end{itemize}
of choosing the unbalanced partition. It is, however, part of the justification for this meta-conversational move to believe in p. Such a question thus necessarily implies that the speaker believes in p.

By contrast, if there is no epistemic conflict or another justification of a meta-conversational move, an interlocutor poses a positive y/n-question or a y/n-question with non-preposed negation, which yield a balanced partition and does not intent a meta-conversational step. Considering the **Principle of Economy**, an interlocutor cannot take the meta-conversational step and pose a preposed negation y/n-question unless there is a conflict or equivalent, which needs to be resolved. Therefore, without previous belief on the part of the speaker, no epistemic conflict arises, and thus there is no reason to ask a preposed negation y/n-question or a question with *really*. Without a speaker’s belief about the truth of p, there is no reason to suggest p and thus the speaker does not choose the meta-conversational step.

The reasoning in the other direction, that is, for why a *normal* y/n-question does not carry an implicature is the following: The choice of a non-preposed negation y/n-question designates the absence of the intent to make a meta-conversational move, which is illustrated in the balanced partition. Moreover, the speaker solely wants to know whether p or not-p is true and she is not interested in the degree of certainty and has no reason for a meta-conversational step. The speaker is merely interested in the addressee’s information and not in the interplay of their assumptions or in suggesting to p to CG. Consequently, if the speaker would in spite of her intention convey her positive belief in the question, then she would not receive the answer of interest and would violate the **Principle of Economy** since she does not have a reason to choose the meta-conversational step. She chooses thus a non-preposed negation question or even a positive y/n-question, which do not contain an implicature.

- The presence of the implicature is explained by pragmatic principles
- The choice for an unbalanced partition needs licensing

### 2.4. The Speaker’s Belief-State

VR&S assume that all negated polar questions convey a presupposition of a speaker’s belief. For most of the polar questions, the **current belief-state** of the speaker is the crucial factor. For INPQs, the **previous belief-state** is of importance. This makes sense under the assumption that all polar questions except INPQs are not context-dependent. For preposed negation questions it is sufficient if the current belief state of the speaker includes the
assumption that p is true. By contrast, previous belief-desire state indicates that earlier in time, the speaker had believed that p is true but then received new and surprising information in the current situation, which challenged her past belief. Thus, for y/n-questions which depend on the current discourse situation the previous belief matters. Else, the current belief is crucial.

Their theoretical account for questions which do not aim for information but serve other purposes like e.g. to mingle or to get a conversation going does, however, not address questions containing a presupposition: “...UV (¬q) > UV (q) because the utility function depends solely on the goal proposition g and P (g/¬q) > P (g/q)\textsuperscript{13}. This says that the utility function (UV) yields a higher value for not-p than for p because the probability to reach the speaker’s goal – e.g. to mingle – is assumed to be higher in case not-p is true than in case p is true. Of course, this might also be the other way around and then the speaker would choose the positive question. Within this formula no measure for a possible positive belief of the speaker occurs.

In order to account for the implicature of negated y/n-questions beside INPQs, vR&S consult the current belief-desire state of the speaker. They explain the puzzle that ONPQs convey a positive speaker’s belief although containing a negation by that the speaker, on the one hand, considers the probability for p to be higher than the probability for not-p. On the other hand the surprisal value of not-p is higher than the surprisal value of p and thus the question contains a negation. The surprisal value constitutes a value of informativity. The intuition behind this is that if the probability for the truth of a certain proposition p is higher than the probability for the truth of not-p, then it is more surprising if the answer is not-p in the end and we have learned more about the world. It is more informative to ask about not-p if the probability for p being true is higher. We learn more about the world if the answer is not-p in case we had previously assumed p to be true with a high probability, that is with P(p) > ½.

Note that vR&S assume ONPQs to contain a negation while B&G and R&H find that ONPQs have no negation within their proposition. In VR&S opinion, ONPQs and INPQs both contain a negation. The difference is that in ONPQs the speaker’s current belief matters while in INPQs a previous belief has an influence on the question. Furthermore, INPQs contain Verum focus because their negation is intonationally marked according to vR&S. VR&S regard

\textsuperscript{13} p. 14 of vR&S (2003)
INPQs as the marked case. They argue, that INPQs are characterized by that the value of information is higher for not-p than for p, and therefore the negative polar question is chosen over its positive version. Like R&H, vR&S regard INPQs as grounding questions in the sense that the speaker had previously believed in p but has now received counterevidence and does not want to ground the new information without double-checking it\textsuperscript{14}. Furthermore, they argue that the negation in cases like B&G’s German example in 23) can be marked intonationally and thus Verum focus arises.

23) Gibt es hier kein vegetarisches Restaurant?
   Is it here no vegetarian restaurant
   Is there no vegetarian restaurant in this area?

The emergence of Verum focus is dependent on the intonation stress on the negation. VR&S point out that preposed negations cannot be stressed and that they can thus not carry Verum focus. Hence, Verum is not due to preposing the negation, which is what R&H have assumed. Verum is rather due to a certain kind of situation – namely the scenario where the speaker wants additional confirmation of the surprising inference that \( \neg p \) is true - and thus puts Verum focus on the negation. INPQs are restricted to a situation where a double-checking of the newly received and surprising information is felicitous. This is in accord with the assumption that INPQs are marked. Concluding, vR&S’s decision theoretic formalism is able to individually account for INPQs, which occur primarily in situations of conflict und thus convey a special form of belief. They have found a way to context-independently explain the presupposition of a positive speaker’s belief of ONPQs.

- The current belief-state of the speaker is modeled by means of the probability function
- The previous belief-state is a special case and marks INPQs
- INPQs are a special case; Verum can be licensed by focus marking in order to account for their presupposition of special contextual requirements
- All other negated questions can be accounted for equally by the current belief-state and the value of informativity

\textsuperscript{14} Notice that the belief comes from previous experiences and is thus different from the belief of the other negated polar questions, where the current belief-desire state matters.
2.5. Licensing of Verum
VR&S agree with R&H in that an operator like Verum needs to be assumed in order to account for certain occurrences of polar questions. In terms of the application of Verum, however, the opinions diverge. While R&H simply stipulate the operator to apply to every question carrying an implicature, vR&H have found a justification of its application to y/n-questions containing a focused negation. This section will investigate, where Verum can be licensed, and where it is essential.

Although R&H find a couple of reasons to assume the presence of an operator like Verum, in the end they merely stipulate it. They submit a couple of reasons for this stipulation. One argument is that covert Verum in preposed negation y/n-questions has a corresponding overt counterpart. That is, the insertion of really in positive y/n-question brings about the negative implicature that the speaker previously believed in the truth of not-p. The reasoning is that if we can find a possibility to uncover Verum with a term which involves the same characteristics as the preposing of the negation does, then Verum’s presence can be assumed in preposed negation y/n-questions. Really contributes the positive implicature to a y/n-question with the negation not.

Another reason for the presence of Verum, put forward by R&H, is that Verum also appears in declarative clauses, in which focal stress falls on the auxiliary verb. In this case, Verum can be licensed by the intention of the speaker “to emphasize or insist on the truth or falsity of the proposition”\textsuperscript{15}. This is compatible with R&H’s semantic meaning of Verum: To emphasize / insist can be paraphrased as FOR-SURE-p and FOR-SURE-not-p, respectively. By assuming that preposed negation questions indeed give rise to a denotation including FOR-SURE-p or FOR-SURE-not-p, Verum should also be applicable to preposed negation questions. That is, the licensed Verum in declarative clauses with focal stress on the auxiliary should concern the same operator Verum as does the preposing of the negation in y/n-questions. Since the former is attested, R&H have good reason to assume that the latter is also licensed.

Let us reassess the arguments in turn. R&H equate the meaning of really with the meaning of the preposing of the negation. It is, however, questionable, whether there is reason to assume that the meaning of really can be equated with what a preposed negation contributes to the meaning of a y/n-question. While really-questions seem to occur in special contexts as vR&S

\textsuperscript{15} Romero & Han (2004), p.630
argue for their focused-negation questions, preposed negation questions presuppose merely that the speaker must believe in the truth of p (see also the experimental results).

Really-questions and preposed negation questions might be in complementary distribution. Considering the scenario in 24), the belief of the speaker and evidence contradicting the belief are sufficient to prompt a preposed negation question, while it is not sufficient to prompt a really-question. The really-question appears to be too strong in this context. There is no reason to use really in this case because the speaker just infers from what Kim has said that Alex is not coming. She does not have direct evidence and just wants to check her own inference. The usage of the really-question would only be appropriate in a context where the speaker would have reason to doubt what the addressee has said because she has direct evidence for her doubt. In 24), however, there is no reason to assume that it is false what Kim had implied.

24) Evening with friends. John, Linda, Alex and Sandra want to meet at Kim’s place. Alex calls Kim to tell her that he is not coming. When John, Linda and Sandra have arrived, Kim says: Ok, we are all here. Let’s go!
S: Isn’t Alex coming?
S’: #Is Alex really not coming?

Turning to 25), the speaker S wants to question what she has just heard and therefore uses a really-question. In order to license such a question, the speaker must have a strong belief based upon clear previous evidence so that she has reason to doubt vehemently the contradicting statement of the addressee, and there must be clear evidence from the current situation, which challenges the previous belief. The evidence in 25) seems to be much too strong to utter a preposed negation question. In fact, the preposed negation question seems to be completely out of place. This might be due to that preposed negations are not able to receive stress (vR&S) and that is what really seems to do: it puts focus on the negation and questions what Kim has said before.

25) Before Sandra leaves home for a disco evening with friends, she gets a call from Alex. He tells her to bring along his DVD she had borrowed from him and says he would meet her at Kim’s place. All friends agreed on meeting at Kim’s place first. When Linda, John and Sandra have arrived, Kim says: Let’s go. We are all here. Alex isn’t coming.
S: Is Alex really not coming?
S’: #Isn’t Alex coming?
Concluding, the argument that Verum in preposed negation questions has found its overt counterpart is not completely sound because the *really*-questions and preposed negation questions appear not to hold an equal distribution. The only characteristic both questions have is the conveyance of the speaker’s belief. In order to license the posing of preposed negation questions, the presence of the positive belief suffices. By contrast, *really*-questions - even though they seem to carry an implicature - need additional licensing through special conversational circumstances.

Turning to the other reason, which R&H submit for the stipulation of Verum, it has the same flaw. Because the licensing of Verum in a declarative sentence with an intonationally stressed auxiliary is given, and because the intention of this declarative resembles the intention of a *really*-questions, it does not mean that Verum is licensed in preposed negation questions also. Especially because R&H adopt their operator from Hoehle’s Verum focus, one might expect that this operator require licensing through a special focus stress on e.g. the negation.

Considering *really*-questions, it is imaginable that the negation preceded by *really* receives focus marking through being in the scope of *really*. There is, however, no reason to assume the preposed negation to be focus-marked as vR&S argue convincingly. The preposed negation cannot receive stress. The presence of the implicature by itself does not seem to be enough to license Verum. Moreover, a justification in terms of the contextual requirements would also not be convincing because – as demonstrated before - preposed negation questions are not restricted to conflict or suggestion scenarios.

Nonetheless, vR&S find that the special use of y/n-questions “... when we receive some surprising new information that we are reluctant to ground without an additional acknowledgement”\(^{16}\) licenses Verum. They put forward that INPQs with focus on the negation occur in such situations and Verum focus is applicable to them. VR&S do not agree with the application of Verum in R&H (2004) in general. They merely assume INPQs to receive Verum focus. The negation must be able to receive stress in order to carry Verum focus and thus their INPQs are not preposed negation questions. The semantics and pragmatics of preposed negation questions can be accounted for without Verum by means of their value of information and by the probability function. Since the negation in *really*-questions can receive focus and *really* indeed seems to emphasize the negation, there is

\(^{16}\) p. 15, vR&S (2003)
evidence that the meaning of Verum can be equated with what *really* inserts into the polar questions. This does not mean that the insertion of *really* into non-preposed negation questions can be equated with preposing the negation since there is good reason to assume that the analysis of preposed negation questions does not require Verum (vR&S). Polar questions with stressed negation or auxiliaries are thus felicitous as grounding questions and can as such be accounted for by means of Verum focus.

In sum, the introduction of Verum into the semantics of polar questions has proved useful in order to account for grounding questions. Preposed negation questions, however, can be accounted for without this additional operator and thus Verum is not an essential part of the semantics of preposed negation questions.

- Verum can neither be licensed in preposed negation questions nor is it essential in their semantics
- Preposed negation questions and *really*-questions cannot occur in the same contexts and can thus not be equated
- In polar questions containing a special intonational stress or *really*, Verum can be licensed and it is even essential for accounting for these questions

Most important points of chapter 2:
- Implicature and presupposition of a speaker’s belief are the same thing considered from a different angle
- R&H explain their implicature by means of pragmatic principles and account for it by inserting a new operator Verum into the semantics of y/n-questions which convey an implication
- vR&S explain the implicature by means of a probability value, which is higher for the positive proposition
- The semantic description of preposed negation questions does not require a special operator
- Verum focus is only essential in accounting for the appearance of grounding questions

3. Ambiguity

It is claimed that English negated questions can be understood as an inquiry about p or as an inquiry about not-p. It is not entirely clear in the literature what is subsumed under the term negated polar questions. R&H clearly define on the one hand the ambiguous preposed negation questions and on the other hand non-preposed negation questions. In B&G (2000), it is not differentiated what is included in the term *negated polar questions*. They do not distinguish between preposed and non-preposed negation questions. While R&H and B&G try
to find ways to account for the ambiguity of negated y/n-questions, vR&S regard the
distinction between INPQs and ONPQs as superfluous.
In the following, R&H’s formal and informal explanation for the ambiguity will be presented.
Then I will analyze how the ambiguity is dealt with in B&G’s approach. Finally, I will
investigate whether the ambiguity can be discarded as vR&S suggest.

3.1. Scope Ambiguity
R&H’s approach comprises the investigation of four types of y/n-questions: positive y/n-
questions (26), non-preposed negation y/n-questions (27) and ambiguous preposed negation
y/n-questions: ONPQs (27) and INPQs (28).

26) Is Jane coming?
27) Is Jane not coming?
28) Isn't Jane coming too?
29) Isn't Jane coming either?

A preposed negation y/n-question can be read as a question about p or as a question about
not-p. In order to disambiguate the reading, R&H insert either the item either, which adjoins
exclusively to negative propositions, or the item too, which adjoins exclusively to positive
propositions\footnote{see also the next section}.

Ladd (1981) reported that the ambiguity of preposed negation y/n-questions would be a scope
ambiguity. Ladd’s intuition pertaining ONPQs such as 28) is that the negation is not within
the proposition but somehow outside of it. By contrast, the propositions of INPQs such as 29)
contain the negation. Hence, the ambiguity should somehow pertain the scope of the negation.
R&H follow this lead and research into different scope possibilities of the negation. They
suggest that the ambiguity between the p and not-p reading is due to a scope ambiguity
between a covert operator Verum and the negation. While in ONPQs negation has scope over
Verum, in INPQs Verum has scope over negation. The question operator Q scopes over
everything because it is the leftmost operator.

30) ONPQ - p-reading: Q Neg VERUM p
31) INPQ - not-p-reading: Q VERUM Neg p

It is under consideration, whether \( p \) or whether \( \neg p \) is positioned under Verum. In this regard, the partitions of ONPQs and INPQs vary. Considering ONPQs, the question is about whether or not the addressee is sure that \( p \) is true as is illustrated in 33) and 35). Turning to INPQs, the question is about whether or not the addressee is sure that \( \neg p \) is true as is shown in 34) and 36). A preposed negation y/n-question like 32) is ambiguous between 35) and 36).

32) Didn’t you see John?

33) ONPQ: [CP Q not [ VERUM [IP you saw John]]]

34) INPQ: [CP Q [ VERUM not [IP you saw John]]]

35) Meaning ONPQ: {it is for sure that we should add to CG that you saw John,

it is not for sure that we should add to CG that you saw John}

36) Meaning INPQ: {it is for sure that we should add to CG that you didn’t see John,

it is not for sure that we should add to CG that you didn’t see John}

A possible syntactic representation of 33) and 34) is given in 37) and 38), respectively. Note that Q is always the outermost operator while the position of Verum varies depending on the proposition within its scope.

37) ONPQ: Didn’t you see John?

---

18 suggested by Hedde Zeijlstra, (p.c.) – thank you!
Depending on whether Verum takes a positive or a negative proposition, it adjoins either to IP or to CP. If Verum resides in the specifier position of CP, then it governs the negation. If Verum resides in the specifier position of IP, then the negation is not within its scope regarding the surface structure.

In sum, R&H explain the different readings of preposed negation polar questions by assuming that the operator Verum may occur in two different positions regarding the surface structure of the proposition at issue. This brings forth that the negation is one time \textit{within} the proposition over which Verum has scope and one time \textit{outside} of the proposition over which Verum scopes.

Beside their formal account for the ambiguity, R&H also provide an informal explanation. As we have already seen above, R&H shed light on two different kinds of contexts in which preposed negation y/n-questions might occur: conflict scenarios and suggestion situations are considered. In conflict scenarios, the speaker believes in p while the addressee seems to imply not-p. In suggestion scenarios, the speaker also believes in p but the addressee is agnostic about p. The ambiguity of preposed negation y/n-questions, however, only occurs in conflict scenarios since a preposed negation y/n-questions cannot be used in order to suggest not-p. The ambiguity can informally be explained by that it is not clear whether the speaker double-checks her/his own belief p or whether she/he double-checks the addressee’s implication that not-p is true.

R&H put forward that the implicature that the speaker believes/believed in the truth of the positive proposition is accompanied by the ambiguity and without implicature there would be...
no ambiguity. They argue that “the presence of an epistemic implicature p is a necessary condition for the p-question/¬p-question ambiguity to arise.” Nevertheless, the implicature that the speaker believes in p is present also in suggestion scenarios, which do not trigger ambiguous questions. Although it seems to hold that the presence of an ambiguity implies the presence of an implicature, it does not hold that the presence of an implicature is equivalent to the presence of the ambiguity. The implicature is present in both contexts – suggestion and conflict - but the ambiguity only arises if the uttering situation entails a conflict. Regardless, the comparison of the two different justifications (conflict and intent to suggest) for preposed negation y/n-questions indicates that it is more important to emphasize that the ambiguity depends on the conflict of the speaker and the addressee than on the implicature. While the implicature is a necessary condition, the conflict (containing the implicature) is sufficient to obtain the ambiguity.

- The ambiguity of preposed negation questions is explained by means of Verum: Either Verum scopes over the positive proposition or Verum scopes over the negated proposition
- The ambiguity is not ascribed to the negation itself but to scope differences ⇒ the ambiguity is not a matter of different kinds of negation according to R&H
- The ambiguity can be put down to the given factors of a conflict scenario

3.2. Excursus: NPIs, PPIs and Proposition Presupposing Items
Before I will scrutinize R&H’s work further, I will firstly dive into their usage of the term polarity item. R&H name too and positive polarity items PI s and either and negative polarity items NI s. The distinction between too and positive polarity items and either and negative polarity items points in the right direction. It is, however, still misleading to combine on the one hand too and positive polarity items and on the other hand either and negative polarity items in one abbreviation. Too and either function completely different from real polarity items like some and any.

While too presupposes a positive proposition to be true, either presupposes a negative proposition to be true. Since too presupposes a positive proposition, it also selects a positive proposition. Since either presupposes a negative proposition, it also selects a negative

\[ 1^{99} \]


37
proposition. That is, *either* selects only negative propositions to adjoin to and *too* only selects positive proposition to adjoin to. For illustration, consider a context like 39) and 40).

39) Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class will drink wine". Maria asks
a. "Will the people from the sports club drink wine too?"
   b. *"Will the people from the sports club not drink wine either?"

40) Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class won't drink wine." Maria asks
a. *"Will the people from the sports club drink wine too?"
   b. "Will the people from the sports club not drink wine either?"

In 39), Hanna provides a positive proposition. This positive proposition satisfies the presupposition of *too* - 42) - so that the question in 39a) is felicitous. Since the requirements of *either* (44) are not fulfilled in the context, the question in 39b) is infelicitous.

The denotation of *too* and *either* are given in 41) and 43), respectively. C is a set of alternative propositions that is derived via focus in the theory of Rooth (1985).

\[
\text{[[too.]]} = \lambda w. \lambda p: (\exists q \in C) q(w).p(w)
\]

\[
\text{[[either.]]} = \lambda w. \lambda p: (\exists q \in C) q(w).p(w)
\]

42) Condition for 18): p does **not** contain a negation
43) Condition for 20): p contains a negation

Turning to 40), the only felicitous question is b). Hanna provides a negative proposition in the context, which is in accord with the presupposition of *either* but which is not in accord with the presupposition of *too*. *Either* thus selects a negative proposition. b) is the only possible question because *either* can only be contained in a question with a negative proposition since it presupposes a negative proposition.

Note that the German analog to English *either* and *too* reveals their just described character even more. In German, there is one single word for *either* and *too: auch (also)*. This does not mean though, that German is not as differentiating as English. German offers the same distinction but by means of scope. What *either* conveys is expressed by *auch* scoping over *nicht: auch nicht*. What *too* conveys is expressed by that no negation is allowed within the
scope of *auch*. Through this difference in scope, it becomes clearly visible in German what I just suggested for English: *auch* selects either a positive proposition or a negative proposition and accordingly presupposes a positive or a negative proposition. Because it is not an obvious matter of scope in English and *too* and *either* seem to be attached to a proposition, it is not as visible that it is *too* which selects a positive proposition and *either* which selects a negative proposition and it is not the proposition which selects the item.

For illustration, consider the examples in 45) – 46). On the one hand, 45) presupposes that it is true that some individuals x, which are present in the current context have not seen the rainbow in the given world because *auch* scopes over the negation. On the other hand, 46) presupposes that it is true that some individuals x, which are present in the current context, have seen the rainbow because there is no negation within the scope of *auch*.

45) Hanna hat den Regenbogen auch nicht gesehen.
    Hanna has the rainbow also not seen
    Hanna has also seen the rainbow

46) Hanna hat den Regenbogen auch gesehen.
    Hanna has the rainbow also seen
    Hanna has also seen the rainbow

In German it is apparent that *auch* selects either a negative (45) or a positive (46) proposition. As opposed to e.g. *any*, *auch* does not need to be in the scope of a negative licenser, but rather selects itself a proposition with the relevant property. The wellformedness of 45) - 46) provides evidence that *auch* selects a proposition rather than being selected by a proposition of a certain polarity. I take this as additional evidence for that *too* and *either* also presuppose a certain polarity from their preceding context rather than requiring a licenser.

In Contrast, polarity items like *any* and *some* are not negative or positive proposition presupposing elements. They rather require a licenser and need to be within the scope of this licenser (see Ladusaw, 1980). Considering 47) and 48), it is illustrated that every occurrence of *any* needs a negative element licensing it.

47) *Jane loves anybody.*
48) Hanna doesn’t love anybody.
In 47), *anybody* is not in the scope of a negation and thus the sentence is ungrammatical. In 48), *anybody* is within the scope of the negation and the sentence is thus well formed. *Any* does not select or presuppose a proposition but merely requires to be in the scope of a negative element. Consequently, the concept of licensing of *any* and *some* is very different from the concept of licensing *too* and *either*.

Concluding, I am not following R&H regarding the notation of *too* and *either*. Instead of *PI* and *NI*, I will refer to *too* and *either* as positive proposition presupposing item (*PPPI*) and negative proposition presupposing item (*NPPI*). Since R&H also term their preposed negation *y/n*-questions as *NI*-questions and *PI*-questions, I will not use their terminology in this regard. Obviously, *PI*-questions correspond to *ONPQs* and *NI*-questions to *INPQs*. I will thus use B&G’s terminology throughout this thesis.

3.3. Morpho-Syntactic Sophistication

B&G suggest that there are three different types of *y/n*-questions: Positive polar questions (*PPQ*) and the two different negated question, which are termed as Inner Negation Polar Questions (*INPQs*) and Outer Negation Polar Questions (*ONPQ*). Considering questions with outer negation, the question aims to ask about *p*, although containing a negation. As the word *inner* already implies, in this case, the negation is within the proposition to which the question operator applies and thus the question seeks to ask about not-*p*. Inner negation then alludes to a negation within a question which inquires not-*p*. B&G assume two different kinds of negation in polar questions. They consult German data with indefinites in order to make the latent ambiguity of the negation in *y/n*-questions observable regarding morpho-syntax\(^{20}\). As opposed to English, in German, the two different readings are allowed for by different morpho-syntactic appearances according to B&G. B&G state that constructions like 49) and 50) are the German analog to the English inner and outer negation, respectively. The construction in 49) corresponds to the outer negation, whereas the construction in 50) conforms to the inner negation. B&G take the *nicht-ein* (*not a*)/kein (*no*) distinction in German as an indicator of inner and outer negation in English.

---

\(^{20}\) Notice that B&G do not clearly differentiate between preposed and not preposed negation and thus *n’t* might as well denote R&H’s non-preposed negation.
The *nicht ein* construction can merely occur in questions or conditionals. By contrast, *kein* is assumed to be a sentential negation (Jacobs - 1980, 1982) and its use is not restricted. In declaratives\(^{21}\) *nicht* and *ein* usually unite to build *kein* (Jacobs - 1980, 1982). That is, *nicht ein* is an exceptional appearance. This suggests that it expresses something different from the sentential negation *kein*. 

*Kein* (50) is special because it consists of two elements. It is not clear what kind of negation is hidden in *kein*. The question arises whether it is the same negation present in the construction *nicht ein* or whether it is a sentential negation. 

In sum, B&G have good reason for their assumption of two different kinds of negation in polar questions.

While in English the ambiguity is resolved through polarity items, in German there is no ambiguity because of sophisticated morpho-syntax. B&G reason with the presentation of German data of the NPI\(^{22}\)-verb construction *brauchen* + infinitive with *zu*. They argue that *brauchen* + infinitive with *zu* is well formed with *kein* (51) but not with *nicht ein* (52).

---

\(^{21}\) In conditionals, *nicht ein* does also not necessarily amalgamate

- a) Ich würde Dich herein bitten, wenn Du nicht einen Hund hättest
  I would you in ask if you not a dog have
  I would ask you in if you would not have a dog
- b) Ich würde Dich herein bitten, wenn Du keinen Hund hättest
  I would you in ask if you no dog have
  I would ask you in if you would have no dog

\(^{22}\) Negative Polarity Item = NPI
B&G take these findings as evidence for that *kein*-questions contain a negative proposition and *nicht-ein*-questions contain a positive proposition. B&G argue that *kein* would consequently correspond to the English *isn’t + either* and *nicht ein* would correspond to the English *isn’t + too*. The ambiguity in English y/n-questions then can be reduced to a lack of differentiation.

The concepts of R&H and B&G drift apart in terms of the distinction of *kein/nicht-ein* in German. While B&G introduce the difference as a device to differentiate between INPQs and ONPQs, R&H put forward that questions including *kein* correspond to questions with non-preposed negation and that questions comprising *nicht-ein* correlate with preposed negation y/n-questions. B&G find that *nicht-ein* corresponds to outer negation while *kein* correlates with inner negation. The main point of disagreement is the implicature: R&H find that questions with *kein* do not presuppose a belief of the speaker while B&G are of the opinion that questions with *kein* have an implication. Considering vR&S’ opinion on this issue, they remark that the *nicht-ein/kein* – distinction can probably not differentiate between INPQs and ONPQs since *kein* can convey both – an inner-negation-reading and an outer-negation-reading. Even if the German data does not differentiate the English negation within y/n-questions, both – inner negation and outer negation – do convey an implication according to all three approaches. B&G and vR&S agree on that y/n-questions containing *kein* contribute an implicature. In the experimental section, it will turn out though that there is evidence for R&H’s intuition.

- Inner and Outer Negation can be distinguished by means of their surface appearance in German
- The ambiguity is due to two different kinds of negation
- It is unclear which status should be ascribed to German *kein*-questions

3.4. Challenging the Ambiguity

VR&S do not differentiate further within the type of negated polar questions. Negative polar questions presuppose that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition in the question. Therefore, vR&S regard the distinction between INPQs and ONPQs and therewith
the assumption of the ambiguity as unnecessary. The reading of INPQs constitutes a special case of negated polar question which needs to be accounted for by means of R&H’s Verum operator. All other negated questions can be accounted for by the same means. Assuming this typology of negation, vR&S fail to account for the case in which the question presupposes a positive speaker’s belief and coevally questions the positive proposition. There is evidence for this question type in that too willingly adjoins to a preposed negation question. VR&S describe, however, ONPQs such that the negative proposition has the higher utility value while the probability is higher for the positive proposition to be true. This indicates, that the question still includes a negative proposition, which is not likely to be the case if too attaches to this proposition.

In sum, it is questionable whether the ambiguity should be abolished if vR&S fail to account for B&G’s reading of ONPQs. In the following, I will examine whether the assumption of the ambiguity is justified in the other approaches.

A linguistic lexicon defines ambiguity as “the phenomenon that an expression has more than one meaning. Two different types of ambiguity can be distinguished on the basis of what is causing it: lexical ambiguity (more than one word meaning) and structural ambiguity (more than one syntactic structure). Ambiguity has to be distinguished from vagueness and context dependence”[23].

Considering this definition, preposed negation questions are clearly ambiguous if looking at the matter from R&H’s perspective. The ambiguity can then be identified as structural ambiguity because R&H ascribe it to a difference in terms of the scope of Verum, which in turn leads to a syntactic ambiguity. It is the achievement of Verum, which provides them with the possibility for justifying the structural ambiguity.

The ambiguity is shown by means of the argument that preposed negation questions are assessed as being well formed no matter whether they contain a PPPI or whether they contain a NPPI. R&H say, however, that non-preposed negation questions can occur with too as well as with either. This suggests that it is generally possible to derive a p and a not-p reading from negated polar questions. Furthermore, R&H argue that non-preposed negation questions do not usually carry an implicature. If a non-preposed negation question contains too, the implicature that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition appears. It

[23] Lexicon of Linguistics, Utrecht University
becomes thus questionable whether R&H’s INPQs do carry an implicature if normal negation questions carry no implicature with either but with too. I take this pattern as indication that y/n-questions questioning a positive proposition – indicated by the presence of too – always presuppose a speaker’s belief while y/n-questions questioning a negative proposition – indicated by the presence of either – do not presuppose a speaker’s belief. If this were the case, then all negated questions would be ambiguous in R&H’s account. As a consequence we would need to assume that there are (only) two different kinds of negation as suggested by B&G: **Outer negation** contributes the presupposition that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition and **inner negation** negates its complement. The difference between the types of negation is attributed to different contextual evidence conditions according to B&G and thus the term ambiguity would not be justified any longer.

In sum, this section has demonstrated that it is neither justified to abolish the ambiguity nor that there are good reasons to assume it. Furthermore, B&G (2000) indicates that there are two different kinds of negation in polar questions, which have diverging felicity conditions on the context. Since the definition of ambiguity states that ambiguity needs to be distinguished from context dependence, B&G approach does not buttress the assumption of the ambiguity.

- VR&S fail to account for ONPQs
- There is evidence for two different kinds of negation
- It is questionable whether the assumption of the ambiguity regarding preposed negation y/n-questions can be adhered

Most important points of chapter 3:
- R&H explain the ambiguity of preposed negation questions by means of different scope domains of Verum
- B&G assume two different kinds of negation, which receives further support
- VR&S turn away from assuming an ambiguity
- It is not clear whether assuming an ambiguity is justifiable

4. German Polar Questions

Up to now, the literature pertaining to English polar questions has been explored. Although B&G have commented on German, they aimed to describe English polar questions. As noted before, the status of the kein-question data which B&G present is discussed controversially and is thus an interesting issue to investigate. This will be done in the last section. Else, the
4.1. Negation in German Polar Questions

If we are looking in German for the equivalent of English high negation questions, we find two possible representations as shown in 53) and 54). Both questions convey the presupposition that the speaker must believe in the truth of the positive proposition.

53) Hat nicht Anna den Kuchen gemocht?
   Aux not Anna the cake liked
   Didn’t Anna like the cake?

54) Hat Anna nicht den Kuchen gemocht?
   Aux Anna not the cake liked
   Didn’t Anna like the cake?

As well as English polar questions, German y/n-questions may comprise preposed as well as non-preposed negations. Their occurrence is, however, not as restricted as in English. German y/n-questions can have up to four different positions for its negation nicht, depending on the verb’s arity. For instance, the ditransitive verb schenken (55) offers four possible positions for nicht. Considering transitive verbs, there are three possible positions for nicht (53, 54, 56) and so on. In the following, the position immediately after the auxiliary will be referred to as first spot/position, the position directly after the subject will be referred to as second spot/position and the position immediately before the main verb will be referred to as third spot/position.

55) Hat (nicht) Anna (nicht) der Maria (nicht) den Kuchen (nicht) geschenkt?
   Aux (not) Anna (not) the Maria (not) the cake (not) given
   Has Anna not given the cake to Maria?

24 Four positions in case there are no additional adverbs
In German, the distinction between preposed and non-preposed negation is not as unambiguous as it is in English. In English, the preposed negation has a morphologic representation, which is different from the morphologic representation of a non-preposed negation. The preposed negation adjoins to the finite verb and the non-preposed negation appears as an item on its own. By contrast, the German types of negation do not differ in their representation. It is merely their surface position, which differentiates them. However, even its surface position cannot be regarded as a perfectly reliable indicator for whether a negation is of a preposed type or whether the negation is of a non-preposed type. Due to discourse related word order variation in German, negations might be ambiguous between being a preposed negation and being a non-preposed negation. In practice though, the position immediately following the auxiliary unambiguously demands a positive belief of the speaker. Even the position following the subject seems to be of the preposed type. A negation in the position directly before the infinite verb, however, does not as clearly presuppose a speaker’s belief. This negation might thus be said to be ambiguous between denoting a preposed and denoting a non-preposed negation. Consider 56) for illustration. Anna and den Kuchen might both have been moved to the left of the negation. Thus, the negation might originally have been a preposed one.

- German negated polar questions either contain a preposed or a non-preposed negation
- The first and the second position usually contain a negation of the preposed type
- The third position is ambiguous between comprising a preposed negation and comprising a non-preposed negation

4.2. Polarity Items as Tools
Polarity items appear to be an effective tool for studying the polarity of a proposition contained in a question as well as for testing for ambiguity. For investigating the polarity, there is need for a positive/negative pair of polarity items. The pair ziemlich/sonderlich will

---

25 If kein-questions are disregarded for a moment
suffice. It is assumed\textsuperscript{26} that licensing contexts for negative polarity items encompass e.g. sentential negation, negative quantifiers and adversative adjectives. On the other hand, positive polarity items appear merely in non-negative contexts. In the following sections, \textit{ziemlich} is used as a positive polarity item and \textit{sonderlich} as a negative polarity item. Their polarity will be justified in the following.

The negative quantifier \textit{keiner} in 57) licenses a negative polarity item (\textbf{NPI}) while it is incompatible with a positive polarity item (\textbf{PPI}). In case a NPI is present, the sentential negation \textit{nicht} accounts for the grammaticality of 58). Moreover, the same sentence is ill formed if \textit{sonderlich} is replaced by \textit{ziemlich}. In the absence of \textit{nicht} (59), \textit{ziemlich} becomes appropriate while \textit{sonderlich} seems to have lost its licenser.

\textbf{57)} Keiner von uns hat den Kuchen sonderlich/*ziemlich gemocht

Nobody of us has the cake \textit{NPI/PPI} liked

Nobody of us quite liked the cake

\textbf{58)} Das Mädelchen hat den Kuchen nicht sonderlich/*ziemlich gemocht

The girl has the cake \textit{NPI/PPI} liked

The girl did not particularly like the cake

\textbf{59)} Das Mädelchen hat den Kuchen *sonderlich/ziemlich gemocht

The girl has the cake \textit{NPI/PPI} liked

The girl quite liked the cake

Additionally, \textit{ziemlich} as well as \textit{sonderlich} are found preceding predicative adjectives. As opposed to \textit{ziemlich}, \textit{sonderlich} again needs a licenser. Note that the licenser not just allows \textit{sonderlich} to occur, but forces \textit{ziemlich} to disappear in favor of \textit{sonderlich}. The contrast between 60) and 61) visualizes this.

\textbf{60)} Eva ist nicht sonderlich/*ziemlich gross

Eva is not \textit{NPI/PPI} tall

Eva is not quite tall

\textbf{61)} Eva ist *sonderlich/ziemlich gross

Eva is \textit{NPI/PPI} tall

Eva is quite tall

\textsuperscript{26} Introductory Handout to the seminar „Polaritaetselemente“ by Arnim v. Stechow & Doris Penka
Prepositions like *ohne* or adversative predicates like *bezweifeln* are also able to license *sonderlich*. *Ziemlich* causes the sentences to be ungrammatical as demonstrated by 62) and 63).

62) John hat sie geküsst, ohne sonderlich/*ziemlich viel dabei zu empfinden
John has her kissed without NPI/PPI much thereby to feel
John has kissed her without thereby feeling particularly much

63) Ich bezweifle, dass er den Kuchen sonderlich/*ziemlich mögen wird
I doubt that he the cake NPI/PPI like will
I doubt that he will particularly like the cake

Concluding, *ziemlich* occurs only in contexts which are usually suitable for PPI and *sonderlich* is found only in contexts which contain a licenser for NPI. In the following I will thus treat *ziemlich* as a PPI and sonderlich as an NPI.

- *Ziemlich* is a positive polarity item
- *Sonderlich* is a negative polarity item

4.3. Confrontation
Let us turn to the ‘tool’, which was used to investigate the polarity of propositions in the considered literature. Ladd, B&G and R&H take advantage of the PPPI/NPPI character of *too/either* in order to demonstrate their intuition about the ambiguity of (preposed) negation questions. The German correspondent to English *either/too* is *auch*. The German *auch* is ambiguous between meaning *either* and meaning *too*. *Auch* conveys a meaning corresponding to English *either* if *auch* scopes over the negation, that is, if it embeds a negative proposition. On the other hand, *auch* conveys a meaning corresponding to English *too* if there is no negation in the scope of *auch* and thus *auch* embeds a positive proposition. Else, *auch* can be used in parallel to the English PPPIs/NPPIs.
Consider the direct translation of 64) and 65), which is given in 66) and 67), respectively. The type of the negation does not depend on the position or the presence of *auch*. That is, the type of the negation should not change if *auch* is deleted from the sentence.
Isn’t Jane coming too?
Isn’t Jane coming either?
Wird Jane nicht auch kommen?
Will Jane not come
Isn’t Jane coming too?
Wird Jane auch nicht kommen?
Will Jane not come
Is Jane not coming either?

Comparing 66) and 67), only the negation within the *nicht-auch* construction can occur in the spot immediately after the auxiliary (68). In 67), *nicht* cannot be preposed from the right hand side of *auch* to the left hand side without changing the meaning of the proposition. *Auch* requires a negation to follow in order to denote the German correspondence to *either*.

68) Wird nicht Jane auch kommen?
Will not Jane come
Isn’t Jane coming too?

Consequently, the negation within the *nicht-auch* construction can be predicted to be of the preposed type. It cannot be determined whether the negation within the *auch-nicht* construction (67) is of the preposed or of the non-preposed type since the position directly before the verb does not clearly convey the presupposition of a speaker’s belief as the previous position does.

In order to derive an unambiguously preposed-negation-reading for the question in 67), an additional negation is required as is shown in 69). This question, however, conveys what the English translation does all the same: It conveys that the speaker believes in that Jane is not coming. It is thus not the correspondent to the English *Isn’t Jane coming either?*

69) Wird nicht Jane auch nicht kommen?
Will not Jane not come
Isn’t Jane not coming either?

Notice that we have encountered a disaccord. The literature on English polar questions argues firstly that the negation *n’t* contained in a polar question is always of the preposed negation
type. Secondly, a question like *Isn’t Jane coming either?* is assessed as being grammatically well formed. By contrast, in German the negation within the direct correspondent (67) to the English *Isn’t Jane coming either?* seems to contain a negation which is not clearly of the preposed type. It is not possible to place the negation into a position which would permit to conclude unambiguously that the type of negation is preposed such that the question presupposes the positive speaker’s belief. Furthermore, 70) demonstrates that it is not possible to prepose *auch nicht* while 71) remains grammatical if *nicht auch* is positioned immediately after the auxiliary. This is actually an indicator for that the *auch-nicht* construction contains a non-preposed negation while there is evidence for that the *nicht-auch* construction includes a preposed negation.

70) *Wird auch nicht Jane kommen?
Will NPPI not Jane come
Isn’t Jane coming either?

71) Wird nicht auch Jane kommen?
Will not PPPI Jane come
Isn’t Jane coming either?

This finding is problematic for two reasons. Firstly, it is unlikely that German patterns different from English: preposed negations in German prohibit a NPPI while preposed negations in English license a NPPI according to R&H. Second, if *either* could be contained in English preposed negation questions although the same construction is not possible in German, then the question arises in which way German expresses what the just mentioned *either*-question communicates: The presupposition for a positive speaker’s belief and questioning a negative proposition. One solution might be to insert an additional particle into the questions. The insertion of the particle *etwa* into a negated y/n-question should cause the presupposition of a positive speaker’s belief (72).

72) Kommt Jane etwa auch nicht?
Come Jane *etwa* NPPI not ?
Is Jane not coming?

The experimental data will suggest, however, that English *either* with a preposed negation is not favored by native speakers of English and that this question type is not sensible to a
positive speaker’s belief. Furthermore, even *etwa* does not provide the desired effect. Thus, as discussed in detail in the experiment section, it seems as if negated polar questions are not responsive to the presence of a speaker’s belief.

- The German correspondent to the English *either* is not well formed if the negation is forced to be of the preposed type
- The assessment of the German data does not agree with the assessment of its English correspondents
- *Etwa* might add the presupposition for a positive speaker’s belief to a negated question
- The type of the negation should not be affected by the presence of *auch*

4.4. Testing for Ambiguity

English preposed negation questions are assumed to be ambiguous. Ladd, B&G and R&H argue for the ambiguity of English preposed negation questions by using NPPIs and PPPIs. English preposed negation y/n-questions can be disambiguated by means of *either* and *too*. The question arises whether German preposed negation questions are ambiguous too. The tool to scrutinize German preposed negation questions is the above described polarity items *ziemlich* and *sonderlich*. It has been demonstrated that *sonderlich* needs a negative element in order to be licensed. *Ziemlich* on the other hand turned out to be unnatural if preceded by a negative element. Hence, if German preposed negation questions can license *sonderlich* and accept *ziemlich* all the same, there is evidence for ambiguity. If a preposed negation question is ill formed containing *sonderlich* and well-formed containing *ziemlich*, there is evidence for that preposed negation questions are unambiguously questioning the positive proposition. If a preposed negation question is ill formed containing *ziemlich* and well-formed containing *sonderlich*, there is evidence for that preposed negation questions are unambiguously questioning the negative proposition. Let us turn to the examples in 73) and 74). The negation should be unambiguously preposed. Considering 74), German preposed negation y/n-questions are clearly not well formed with NPPIs. Strikingly, the question in 73) is perfectly well formed with the PPI *ziemlich*. In contrast to the English preposed negation questions, there is thus evidence that German preposed negation questions are not ambiguous between a *p* and a not-*p* reading.
73) Hat nicht das Maedchen den Kuchen ziemlich gemocht?

Has not the girl the cake PPI liked
Did the girl not like the cake?

74) *Hat nicht das Maedchen den Kuchen sonderlich gemocht?

Has not the girl the cake NPI liked
Did the girl not like the cake?

The fact that only PPIs are licensed by preposed negation questions suggests that preposed negation questions inquiry about a positive proposition. The negation’s only function seems to be to contribute the presupposition for a positive speaker’s belief, which is present in German just like in English. This will be supported by the experimental results for English and for German.

- German preposed negation questions are not ambiguous
- German preposed negation questions question the positive proposition and presuppose a positive speaker’s belief

4.5. Differing Ambiguity Patterns?

English polar questions have been analyzed by assuming two kinds of negation, which differ morpho-syntactically: *n’t and not. The former contributes an implicature to the question and the latter does not.

In German, the kind of negation cannot as easily be determined by its surface position and morpho-syntax. We have seen that preposed negation questions in German are not ambiguous and clearly inquire about p. A preposed negation question is thus determinable by the use of a PPI. A question with a negation in the third position seems to be ambiguous because it can host both kinds of polarity items (75). This is striking because we thus obtain an ambiguity pattern which is opposite for German and English. While in German preposed negation questions are unambiguous, in English preposed negation questions are predicted to be ambiguous. While in English non-preposed negation questions are unambiguous, in German non-preposed negation questions are ambiguous.

75) Hat Karin den Kuchen nicht sonderlich/ziemlich gemocht?

Has Karin the cake not NPI/PPI liked
Did Karin not particularly like the cake?
The question arises whether this is the same ambiguity which R&H propose for English preposed negation questions. The predictions from the preceding section would rather be that the third position is ambiguous between containing a preposed negation and containing a non-preposed negation. In German, the ambiguity is not only pertaining to the different reading possibilities of the question (questioning p or not-p) but also to whether the question presupposes a speaker’s belief or not. R&H say that the only way English non-preposed negation questions can occur with the PPPI too “if it is acceptable at all, is with an epistemic implicature”\(^27\). In German, there seems to be a similar effect. If a PPI is present, an implicature is perceived no matter which position the negation occupies. An NPI does not have this effect. It is thus not likely that the third position always contains the same type of negation while being ambiguous between a p and a not-p reading. The most likely explanation is that negations in the third spot are ambiguous between being preposed and being non-preposed. A question with a preposed negation asks about p and presupposes the speaker’s positive belief and a question with a non-preposed asks about not-p and does not usually presuppose a speaker’s belief.

Summarizing, polarity items can disambiguate the type of negation in the third position. The third position may host preposed as well as non-preposed negations.

- There is evidence that a negation in the third position is ambiguous between being preposed and being non-preposed
- Negations in the first and second spot can be unambiguously determined as being of the preposed type
- In German, preposed negation questions include inquiring p while presupposing a positive speaker’s belief
- In German, non-preposed negation questions include inquiring not-p and do not necessarily presuppose a speaker’s belief

4.6. Polar questions with *kein*

Up to now, only polar questions with the usual negation *nicht* have been analyzed. German additionally has the special negation *kein*, which has set off a controversy about *kein*’s type of negation. Remember that *kein* is special because it consists of two elements (*nicht* and *ein*)

\(^27\) p.621 of R&H (2004)
and thus it is not clear what kind of negation (preposed or normal sentential negation) it contains.

Therefore, the first question I want to investigate in this section is to which question type *kein*-questions correspond. *Kein* usually occurs instead of the negation *nicht* in case of indefinites, where the indefinite determiner *ein* is amalgamated with *nicht* in order to build *kein* (Jacobs - 1980, 1982). Since the determiner has to precede the noun, *kein* cannot occur in the position immediately before the verb. *Kein* might occur as an indefinite negative determiner before object or subject or on its own. As we have seen above, preposed negation questions only license PPIs but not NPIs. The selective polarity items should thus be able to suggest to which negation type *kein* corresponds or whether it is ambiguous.

Strikingly, as opposed to the negation within the third position, *kein* allows *sonderlich* but not *ziemlich* (76 - 78). This finding suggests that *kein* belongs to the non-preposed negation type since - from what we have seen - the preposed negation type cannot occur with NPIs.

76) Hat keiner das Mädchen sonderlich/*ziemlich* geliebt?
   Has no one the girl NPI / PPI loved
   Has no one particularly loved the girl?

77) Hat Karl keinen seiner Mitarbeiter sonderlich/*ziemlich* gemocht?
   Has Karl none of his coworkers NPI / PPI liked
   Has Karl not particularly liked anybody of his coworkers?

78) Hat das Mädchen keinen der Männer sonderlich/ *ziemlich* attraktiv gefunden?
   Has the girl none of the men NPI / PPI attractive found
   Has the girl not found any of these men particularly attractive?

*Kein* might yet be a special type of negation, to which other ‘laws’ apply. One might expect that *kein*-questions are either preposed or non-preposed negation questions depending on the type of the negation which has amalgamated with *ein* in order to form *kein* (B&G, 2000). This would explain why R&H find that *kein*-questions presuppose no speaker’s belief while B&G regard them as conveying an implication. B&G’s intuition is that *kein*-questions include a slight implication. According to R&H, in English there are negated questions which ask about not-p while at the same time conveying a positive implicature. Besides, B&G propose that German *kein*-questions are the equivalent to questions which ask about not-p while conveying a positive implicature. If this is the case, it is no surprise that the PPI was not allowed and *kein*-questions may also contain a preposed negation while asking about not-p. The evidence
from the polarity items might thus just suggest that the question is about not-p and it does not say anything about the implicature or the type of negation. Naturally, if a question contains both possibilities – to use it with or without implicature – the implicature is harder to detect than in questions which are merely possible with the conveyance of a positive belief. Because it is not clear, which negation *kein* denotes, the implicature it might contribute is not as eye-catching as would be the case if the negation would unambiguously presuppose a speaker’s belief. This agrees well with B&G’s intuition that *kein* yields a weak implication.

This reasoning can also account for the conflict between R&H and B&G. *Kein*-questions always inquire about the negative proposition but differ in whether they carry an implicature or not.

Concluding, if this theory holds, *kein*-questions always ask about not-p but they are ambiguous in terms of the presence or absence of an implicature. This would imply, that *kein* is a special kind of negation which does neither belong to the German preposed negation questions nor to the German non-preposed negation questions. This will be tested in the experiment section.

- The status of *kein*-questions is not clear yet
- *Kein* might be an unambiguously non-preposed negation
- *Kein* might be a special kind of negation, which inquires about not-p while being ambiguous between presupposing and not presupposing a positive speaker’s belief

Most important points of chapter 4

- In German polar questions, the position immediately before the verb is ambiguous between containing a preposed and containing a non-preposed negation; the preceding positions are reserved for preposed negations
- The English data are in disaccord with the findings regarding the corresponding German data when it comes to the meaning of preposed negation questions
- German preposed negation questions are unambiguously questioning the positive proposition while presupposing a positive speaker’s belief
- German has (at least) two different kinds of negation in its polar questions
- *Kein* might be a third kind of negation, being able to inquire about not-p while presupposing a positive speaker’s belief
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Part II: Experimental Section

The four chapters of Part I were intended to provide an overview of the current literature on this topic and tried to scrutinize each approach in terms of its claims in terms of

- Contextual factors
- The presupposition of a positive speaker’s belief and explanation for it
- Whether negated y/n-questions are ambiguous and how it can be accounted for the ambiguity

Furthermore, German polar questions received an analysis parallel to the English polar questions. Regarding most issues the intuitions drifted apart and we have encountered discrepancies between German and English polar questions. Thus, it is important to investigate the matters empirically. Chapter 1 will explore English polar questions and chapter 2 will examine German polar questions.

1. English Polar Questions

1.1. What is tested

The following questions are intended to summarize the obscurities which arose during the theoretic part.

1. Context Dependency:
   a. Does the interaction of speaker and addressee trigger a certain question type?
   b. Is contextual evidence responsible for licensing a certain question type?
   c. Is the implicature that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition by itself the decisive factor in terms of question choice?

2. Which types of polar questions presuppose a positive speaker’s belief?

3. Is it the case that [n’t] = [not] in y/n-questions? What is the difference between y/n-questions with preposed negation and those with normal negation?

4. If non-preposed negation questions occur with too, do they carry an implicature? Are they equivalent to preposed negation questions with too?

5. Are preposed negation y/n-questions ambiguous between a p-reading and a not-p-reading?
1.2. Method
The experiments were conducted with the aid of WebExp2\textsuperscript{28}. The questionnaire was thus administered over the internet. The participants were explicitly instructed on a webpage and received two training trials. In the first training trial, they were introduced to the method of rating. The participants had to judge the length of a bar relative to the given length of two other bars. In the second training trial, their task was to rate the naturalness of a short English sentence in comparison to given ratings of two other English sentences, differing in their level of naturalness. In the test trials, native speakers were asked to rate the naturalness of positive, preposed and normal negation questions – also in comparison to sentences with given ratings. The sentences for comparison remained unchanged for training and for test trials. All questions were presented in controlled contexts. Participants were presented with sequences such as 79) and were asked to judge how well the question fits its context.

79) A gold-digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger doesn't know who was involved. The barman says "Only the deputy sheriff shot bandits yesterday." The gold-digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits, too?"

1.2.1. Participants
Twenty-five native speakers of English (mostly US-American, but also Canadian, Irish or British) were recruited with the chance to win $75.

1.2.2. Design, Material and Procedure
The four versions of the questionnaire were built from 8 different lexical items\textsuperscript{29}, 6 different context types and 5 different question types. Every lexicalization included 16 conditions. \textit{Table 1} presents the conditions tested (marked with an x).

The contexts differed regarding three parameters; the parameter names are highlighted in bold face. Firstly, the contexts included either the \textbf{speaker’s belief} that $p$ is true as demonstrated by the second sentence in 80); or it indicated that the speaker did not have any belief in terms of the proposition $p$ as demonstrated in 81).

\textsuperscript{28} Many thanks to the We2 Development Team. Many thanks for financial support of We2 from the University of Edinburgh E-Learning Fund and the Psychology Network of the Higher Education Academy.

\textsuperscript{29} Lexical item: lexically varying contexts and questions
80) A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "The deputy didn't manage to shoot any bandits, so they all got away." The gold digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits, either?"

Conditions tested in the English Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question with preposed negation</th>
<th>Context+Speaker’s Belief</th>
<th>Context+NoSpeaker’s Belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counterevidence,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulfills Presup of too</td>
<td>Counterevidence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fulfills Presup of either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question with normal negation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral, Fulfills Presup of too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counterevidence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fulfills Presup of either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral, Fulfills Presup of too</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>with either</th>
<th>with too</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>with either</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with too</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Questions</td>
<td>with too</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

The second factor refers to the presupposition of either and too: Either the statement immediately preceding the question at issue fulfilled the presupposition of a question with too as demonstrated in 79) or it satisfied the presupposition of a question with either as demonstrated in 80). The third factor refers to the bias of the context: Either the context provided counterevidence (79, 80) or it was neutral in nature (81).

81) A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "The deputy shot some bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits, either?"

The appearance of the English questions varied in terms of two parameters. Firstly, the questions differed regarding their type. Questions contained either n’t or not or were positive. Furthermore, questions either included either or too. Too and either had their focus consistently on the subject of the question. Positive questions were only presented with too. Preposed and non-preposed negation questions were seen with too and either since, according to R&H, those items disambiguate whether the question asks about the positive or the negative proposition, respectively. 82) – 86) illustrate the different types of questions used in the experiment.
A context was combined with a question if they agreed in the usage of a certain item: A question with *either* was only seen in a context which was in accord with the presupposition of *either*; a question with *too* was only seen in a context which was in accord with the presupposition of *too*.

In sum, there were 16 different combinations of context and question for each lexical item. Each of the four versions of the questionnaire was seen by a different group of raters. However, the numbers of participants per group were not uniform due to technical problems with the use of WebEx2. The problem was that WebEx2 does not support the automatic change from one version of the experiment to the next if enough participants have completed a certain version. Each version of the questionnaire comprised 32 test combinations of context and question and 10 fillers. Thus, every participant saw each condition twice and each lexical item four times.

1.3. Results
Firstly, I will present and explain the **error-bars** of the results in *Figure 1*. Then I will provide the statistical analysis of the data and discuss the outcome.

1.3.1. Comments to *Figure 1*

*Figure 1* presents the so-called **error-bars** of the experimental results. The error-bars are calculated from the normalized values of the ratings (includes subject and item analysis) for each condition. For the reader who is unversed in terms of statistics, I will shortly explain what error-bars are. Error-bars consist of the mean for each condition (indicated by the little circle in the middle of each bar) and the 95% confidence interval of the mean. The **true value** is within the range of the bar with a probability of 0.95. There is a statistically significant difference between the ratings of different conditions if the confidence interval of one condition does not reach the mean of the error bar of the other condition and the other way around.
The bars are individually colored depending on the question type they represent (see also legend on the right hand side of the table). On the x-axis, the different context types are given. **PresupEither** denotes contexts which contain evidence against p and fulfill the presupposition of either. In the above scenario the counterevidence is “The deputy sheriff did not shoot any bandits yesterday. So they all got away.”. **-B** tells you that the context indicated the absence of a speaker’s belief about the proposition at issue, e.g. *the gold digger doesn't know who was involved.*; **+B** tells you that the context indicated the presence of the speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true, e.g. *the gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits.*

![Figure 1](image.png)

**PresupToo** denotes contexts which convey evidence against p and fulfill the presupposition of too; in the above scenario the counterevidence is “Only the deputy shot bandits yesterday.”

**Neutral** denotes contexts which are of neutral nature and fulfill the presupposition of too; in the above scenario the context is: “The deputy shot some bandits yesterday”. This statement is not biasing the speaker to think into a certain direction regarding the state of affairs.

The y-axis yields the normalized ratings for how naturally a certain question type defined in the legend on the right hand side of Figure 1 fits one of the context types on the x-axis. The higher the value on the y-axis, the more natural/felicitous the participants have found the question in the respective context. Each type of question is represented by a certain color, which can be identified in the legend.
1.3.2. Statistics

The global, statistical differences of the data were calculated by means of repeated measures of analysis of variance (ANOVA). Each analysis was done by subject as well as by lexical item. The degrees of freedom were corrected where necessary; for presentational purposes, however, only the uncorrected value is given in the following. The F-value was corrected by the method of Huynh-Feldt.

Furthermore, planned comparisons were used to compute paired t-tests. In this way, statistical differences could be obtained more specifically. The p-value was assumed to reach significance if its value was p ≤ 0.05; values 0.05 < p < 0.1 are said to be of marginal significance. P-values < 0.01 demonstrate a very significant difference and p-values < 0.001 approach high significance.

Considering the left half of Figure 1 (blue and purple bars), we see that the purple bars represent lower values than the blue bars. This difference is reflected in a significant effect of the question type (preposed or non-preposed negation question) ($F_1 (1,24) = 9.120; p = 0.006; F_2 (1,7) = 16.741; p = 0.005$). I take this as evidence that high negation polar questions are marked if containing either. Since there is no effect of the speaker’s belief (Fs < 1), there is no evidence that negated questions with either presuppose a speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true.

Turning to the questions with too in the middle of the table (green, red and orange bars in PresupToo contexts), the error bars of questions within contexts with a speaker’s belief demonstrate higher ratings than the error bars of questions within contexts without a speaker’s belief do. This is reflected in a significant effect of the speaker’s belief ($F_1 (1,24) = 7.941; p = 0.010; F_2 (1,7) = 5.914; p = 0.045$). I take this as evidence that negated questions containing too presuppose the speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true.

Furthermore, questions with non-preposed negation (green bars) receive lower values than questions with preposed negation (red bars). The statistical effect of the question type is highly significant ($F_1 (2,48) = 12.732; p < 0.001; F_2 (2,14) = 17.748; p < 0.001$). This finding provides evidence for that questions containing non-preposed negation and too are marked while questions containing preposed negation and too are perfectly grammatical.

30 By doing this one makes sure that the conclusion drawn is not due to the judgements of a certain subject or the features of a certain lexicalization but can be generalized
While positive questions received higher values than preposed negation questions in \(-B\) neutral contexts, the ratings of both question types are equally high in \(+B\) neutral contexts. This is reflected in an interaction effect of question type and speaker’s belief \((F_1(2,48) = 8.625; p = 0.001; F_2(2,14) = 5.423; p = 0.018)\) and in a marginal effect of the speaker’s belief \((F_1(1,24) = 4.076; p = 0.055; F_2(1,7) = 8.840; p = 0.02)\). The ratings of preposed negation questions with \textit{too} show a statistically significant effect of the speaker’s belief \((p_1 = 0.001, p_2 = 0.008)\); the ratings increase in case the speaker’s belief is present in the context. I take this as evidence that preposed negation questions generally presuppose a positive speaker’s belief. Positive questions do not presuppose a positive speaker’s belief. The effect of the question type is influenced by the effect of the speaker’s belief – if there is no speaker’s belief, preposed negation questions received significantly lower values than in the \(+B\) context and thus there is an interaction effect.

The ratings of non-preposed negation questions are much lower than the ratings of the preposed negation and positive questions. This is reflected in a highly significant effect of the question type \((F_1(2,48) = 12.950; p < 0.001; F_2(2,14) = 14.007; p < 0.001)\). Preposed negation questions with \textit{too} are generally preferred over non-preposed negation questions with \textit{too}.

A test of the status of normal negation questions with \textit{too} in all different contexts yielded as a result a significant difference of the rating of normal negation questions in a context with a speaker’s belief and in a context without a speaker’s belief \((p_1 = 0.017, p_2 = 0.008)\). This is indication for that this question type presupposes a positive speaker’s belief.

There are a couple of questions left, which have not been accounted for by the more general analysis. Consider the question which factor(s) trigger a speaker to choose asking a \textit{preposed negation} question. In order to test this, preposed negation questions with \textit{too} in neutral contexts and in contexts with counterevidence were analyzed in the presence and in the absence of a contextual speaker’s belief. The impact of the context type is marginally significant \((F_1(1,24) = 3.852; p = 0.061; F_2(1,7) = 7.121; p = 0.032)\). There was, however, a main effect of the presence of a speaker’s belief \((F_1(1,24) = 12.947; p = 0.001; F_2(1,7) = 21.739; p = 0.002)\). This provides evidence that the speaker’s belief in the context is more important for the licensing of a preposed negation question than is the current contextual evidence.
1.4. Discussing the Results

1.4.1. Speaker’s Belief

Surprisingly, the presence of a speaker’s belief does not have an effect on the rating of preposed negation questions with *either*. According to R&H, preposed negation questions with *either* presuppose a positive belief of the speaker. The presence of a speaker’s belief should thus have an effect on their rating. The missing effect of the speaker’s belief implies – especially in contrast to the great effect of the presence of a speaker’s belief on preposed negation questions with *too* – that preposed negation questions with *either* do not presuppose the presence of a speaker’s belief. This finding agrees with B&G’s predictions. According to them, the implication of INPQ is not as strong as the implication of ONPQs.

It is not so surprising though that the presence of a speaker’s belief does not influence non-preposed negation questions since their occurrence is not dependent on the presence of a contextual speaker’s belief (R&H).

R&H’s intuitions about preposed negation questions with *too* are supported by the results. The presence of a speaker’s belief in the context has an increasing effect on the ratings. That is, preposed negation questions presuppose that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition and thus the fulfillment of this requirement in the preceding context improves their felicity. The pattern of normal-negation questions with *too* demonstrates a similar effect. A contextual presence of a speaker’s belief causes the ratings to rise. This conforms with R&H’s prediction that this question type carries an implication too.

Furthermore, the significant difference between the ratings for preposed negation questions and normal negation questions complies with R&H’s claim that this question type is marked.

- Preposed negation questions with *too* presuppose the positive belief of the speaker in terms of p
- Negated questions with *either* do not presuppose a speaker’s belief

1.4.2. Markedness

The main effect of question type in *PresupEither* contexts along with the low ratings for preposed negation questions with *either* suggest that preposed negation questions with *either* are evaluated as being less natural as their normal-negation counterparts. Since preposed negation questions with *either* are inherently marked as suggested by their low ratings, the presence of a speaker’s belief in the context might not be able to improve its felicity. There is thus no effect of the speaker’s belief.
The statistical difference between the ratings of preposed negation questions and non-preposed negation questions with *either* might be due to that *either* demands a non-preposed negation and is not satisfied with a preposed negation in general. Since normal negation questions with *too* also receive significantly lower ratings than preposed negation questions with *too*, we obtain the following pattern:

**Preposed negation questions are marked with *either* while non-preposed negation questions are marked with *too*. Preposed negation questions with *too* and non-preposed negation questions with *either* are natural.**

This assumption has consequences. It is evidence for that preposed negation questions generally question the positive proposition and normal negation questions question the negative proposition. This in turn challenges the ambiguity. It is not necessary to assume an ambiguity of two morpho-syntactically different questions, which clearly differ in their meaning.

The values for *either*-questions are generally lower than the values for preposed negation questions with *too* and positive questions with *too*. This might be due to the presence of *either*. Observe the following example of a context in which *either*-questions were seen:

87) Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class won't drink wine, so we won't need any." Maria asks
   "Won't the people from the sports club drink wine *either*?"
   "Will the people from the sports club not drink wine *either*?"

It might be the case that subjects do not find *either* felicitous in this context because there is a clause (...so we won't need any) in between the clause which fulfills the presupposition of *either* and the questions containing *either*.31 This does, however, just explain why *either*-questions received lower ratings but it cannot be the reason for why the ratings for preposed negation questions are worse than the ratings for normal-negation questions with *either*. Normal-negation questions also contain *either* and are significantly higher rated than their preposed negation counterparts. As explicated in the next section, I assume that the reason for the low ratings of the preposed negation questions can be put down to that *either* makes a difference.

---

31 Thanks to Prof Lyn Frazier for pointing this out to me
between preposed negations and normal negations and prefers to appear in questions with normal negation. There is actually no other reason for this pattern since the conditions of preposed negation questions with *either* and normal negation questions with *either* were identical except for the position of the negation. In addition, the preposed negation questions with *too* received significantly higher ratings than preposed negation questions with *either*.

- Preposed negation questions are marked with *either* while non-preposed negation questions are marked with *too*
- Preposed negation questions with *too* and non-preposed negation questions with *either* are natural

1.4.3. Context and Speaker’s Belief

Turning to the effects of context type versus the effects of the speaker’s belief on the rating of preposed negation questions with *too*, the effect of the presence of a speaker’s belief exceeds undoubtedly the effect of the context. That is, it is not merely the concurring of the positive speaker’s belief and the negative evidence, which is responsible for the occurrence of a preposed negation question. There is no statistical interaction of the variables. The presence of a speaker’s belief by itself has a main effect on preposed negation questions. The impact of the negative bias of the context is only marginally significant.

The first effect is easy to explain: a preposed negation presupposes a positive belief of the speaker and receives thus higher ratings if the presupposition is fulfilled.

The marginal effect of the context might be explained by R&H’s proposal that preposed negation questions like to occur in scenarios of conflict between the speaker’s belief and the implication of the addressee. The decision for the meta-conversational step of asking a preposed negation question can be licensed by this conflict. Maybe, the conflict is a stronger or a better licenser than the presence of a speaker’s belief by itself and thus results in higher ratings.

On the one hand, these findings provide evidence for R&H’s proposal that the speaker’s belief and the contextual bias both play a role in triggering a preposed negation question. On the other hand, the given effects clearly indicate that it is not mainly the current context or the statement the addressee utters, which determines that a preposed negation question is asked. The most weightily effect is seemingly caused by the presence of a speaker’s belief. This opposes B&G’s intuitions. They suggest that polar questions depend primarily on their current context.
Note that the results do not mean that it is just these contexts in which preposed negation questions can occur. I did not test for any context but only investigated this certain occurrence of preposed negation questions in this certain contexts.

- Both – the contextual evidence as well as the speaker’s belief in the context play a role in licensing a preposed negation question
- The speaker’s belief is however the crucial factor in licensing a preposed negation question

Most important points of 1.4.

- *Either*-questions are not responsive to the presence of a speaker’s belief
- Preposed negation questions with *either* and non-preposed negation questions with *too* are marked, which challenges the assumption of the presence of an ambiguity
- Preposed negation questions contain a positive proposition and presuppose a positive speaker’s belief
- The evidence from the context only has a minor effect on the values of preposed negation questions with *too*

1.5. Implication of the Results

1.5.1. Different Types of Negation

We have seen that *either* does not like to occur in a preposed negation question and that *too* likes to occur in a preposed negation question rather than in a low negation question. The ratings of preposed negation questions containing *too* are in significant excess of the ratings of low negation questions with *too*. Hence, there is evidence that low negation questions are marked if containing *too* and that preposed negation questions are marked if containing *either*. Considering this pattern, I would like to suggest the following explanation: High negations are so high within the syntactic structure that *either* has to adjoin to a positive proposition and the question is thus marked. Questions with the negation above *too* within the syntactic tree are unmarked because *too* can take a positive proposition as preferred. 88) illustrates this. 32

---

32 The negation might have originated in NegP but it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the syntactic position of the negation.
Isn’t John coming too/*either?

If the negation is non-preposed, questions comprising too are marked because too had to attach to a negative proposition. This might be the causal factor for the ungrammaticality of the question in 89) if containing too. If containing either, the question in 89) is unmarked because either can take a negative proposition as required.

Is John not coming either/*too?

The pattern which too and either demonstrate suggests that English comprises two different kinds of negation in polar questions. The two types of negation are disambiguated by their syntactic position plus morphology, and by the behavior of too and either. The low negation type is used in order to ask about not-p no matter whether the speaker has a certain belief about p. Since the belief-state of the speaker does not have an effect on the values for either-questions, there is no need to assume a presupposition of a positive speaker's belief in terms of this question type. Since too is known to adjoin to positive propositions while either is said to require a negated proposition, I want to argue that preposed negation questions differ from positive questions only in that they convey a positive belief of the speaker. Therefore, it is
necessary to specify a special meaning for preposed negations while non-preposed negations are treated as taking a positive proposition and yielding its complement as usual. I propose that we do not longer name *n’t preposed negation* since it obviously does something else than negate a proposition. It is rather a presuppositional operator, which I will call *n’tPrO* (*PrO* = presuppositional operator). Simply put, *n’tPrO* contributes the presupposition that the speaker believes in the complement of *n’t*, that is, in *p*. The meaning of *n’tPrO* is given in 93). It presupposes that in all worlds that are compatible with what the speaker *s* believes, *p* is true. I further assume that *n’tPrO* requires being in the scope of the question operator *Q* (92) since it can only occur in questions (91). The negative marker *n’t* in declarative sentences like 90) do not convey a belief of the speaker that the positive proposition is true.

90) Jane isn’t coming.

The meaning of the contracted negation in declarative sentences thus corresponds to the normal-negation and the meaning of *n’tPrO* does not apply to it.

Considering the application of *Q* to the proposition in the scope of *n’tPrO*, it turns out that *Q* skips *n’tPrO* and applies to the proposition without even noticing *n’tPrO*. The question operator is said to be a *hole* to the presupposition’s projection (Karttunen, 1973). Consequently, the whole meaning of a question containing *n’tPrO* consists of two parts evaluated on different levels. This is also what vR&S propose in order to account for the different kinds of polar questions: keep the denotations equal in the semantics but account for the differences on a pragmatic level.

On the presuppositional level (PL) - 94), we add that the speaker believes in *p*. On a strictly semantic level - 93), the question operator is applied to the proposition just as in any other question and yields \{that *p*, that not *p*\}.

91) Isn’t John coming?

92) **Licenser of n’tPrO**: *n’tPrO* requires being in the scope of *Q*

93) \([^\text{[n’PrO]}_{w,s}\]w = \lambda p: \forall w’ [w’ \in \text{Dox} (g(s), w) \rightarrow p(w’)] . p\]

94) **Denotation**: *Q* \([^\text{[John is coming]}\] = \{John is coming, John is not coming\}

95) **Presupposition**: *s* believes that John is coming
In sum, the findings suggest that polar questions with preposed negation usually ask about the positive proposition while non-preposed negation questions usually question the negative proposition.

This in turn challenges the claim that preposed negation questions in English are ambiguous. If *either* preferably adjoins to the proposition of questions containing a low negation and *too* preferably adjoins to the proposition contained in preposed negation questions, then there is evidence for that preposed negation questions are not ambiguous. Rather, it seems as if they are merely used to express a positive question, which conveys a positive belief of the speaker.

- English seems to comprise two different kinds of negation, one of which does not even negate the proposition but merely contributes the presupposition for a positive speaker’s belief. The other negation takes a proposition and yields its complement as usual.
- Preposed negation questions seem to contain a positive proposition
- I suggest to assume an operator *n’t*-PrO, which represents what the preposed negation adds to a polar question

1.5.1. Presuppositional Level

VR&H have suggested to retain the semantic denotation for all polar questions as supplied before but make a distinction on the pragmatic level in order to account for the differences between the different subtypes of polar questions. This constitutes an elegant and easy method to account for the underlying complexities of polar questions in general.

If the normal negation in y/n-questions does not contribute more than to deliver the complement of the proposition in its scope, then it follows that positive and negative polar questions semantically denote the same as long as there is no *n’t*-PrO. Both receive the denotation \{\text{that } p \text{ is true, that not-}p \text{ is true}\}. B&G argue, however, that positive and negative polar questions are not the same because they have found that positive and negative polar questions differ in their occurrence conditions.

VR&S state that positive questions are the default question type. If there is a reason to pose a negated question, it is chosen. A negative question is only felicitous if there is a reason to pose it. If there is a reason to pose the negative question, then a positive question becomes infelicitous. VR&S’s suggestion differs from B&G’s evidence conditions in not being context dependent. They assume that a reason for posing a negated question can be anything. For instance, the negative proposition might be of greater interest than the positive one because the doctor wants to find out what is not right with the patient and not what is in good order.
If positive questions are assumed to be the default questions and \( n \)'t\text{\textit{no}}\)-questions differ from the denotation of positive questions in that there is a semantic contribution on the presuppositional level (PL), it suggests itself that a negated question (non-preposed negation question) also receives a contribution to its meaning from PL. The ratings for \( n \)'t\text{\textit{no}}\)-questions highly exceed the ratings of positive questions in contexts which provide a reason to not choose a plain positive question. This is evidence for that a question which is not a plain, positive default question presupposes a reason for the addition. In case of \( n \)'t\text{\textit{no}}\)-questions, the reason is mainly the speaker’s belief. The requirement for a reason for occurrence could also be transferred to normal negation questions. Since the reason for the negation in normal negation questions is not as concrete as is the speaker’s belief in \( n \)'t\text{\textit{no}}\)-questions, we could name it felicity condition for negated y/n-questions. Such felicity condition would apply on the same level like the presupposition of \( n \)'t\text{\textit{no}}\)-questions does. The semantic denotation of y/n-questions might consist of contributions from two levels – the level on which usually truth conditions are determined (98) and the level on which presuppositions apply (97).

96) Is John not coming?

97) PL: there is a reason for adding the negation to p

98) Denotation: \{that John is coming, that John is not coming\}

The meaning of positive questions does not receive an addition from the presuppositional level because they are the default choice.

Concluding, by assuming that the meaning of a y/n-question consists of contributions from two levels, it is possible to account for similarities (that the set of possible answers of all y/n-questions includes two possibilities) and for the described differences of the different types of y/n-questions at the same time.

Notice that this suggestion accounts for what vR&S’s decision theoretic account did not allow for: That preposed negation questions inquire about p and presuppose a positive speaker’s belief. They intend to account for all unfocused-negation questions by assuming the question to contain a negative proposition, which is seemingly not always the case as the experimental results suggest.

33 In order to see this, take a look at the questions within two contexts in the middle of Figure 1.
• By assuming a presuppositional level the semantics can remain as supplied before
• The different polar questions receive different entries on the presuppositional level

Most important points of Chapter 1

• There seems to be no reason to retain the assumption of the ambiguity pertaining preposed negation questions
• The differences between the different types of polar questions can be accounted for on the presuppositional level
• N’tro-Questions presuppose the speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true
• Positive polar questions (if not carrying special focus marking) are the default polar question and have no entry on PL
• Negative polar questions are only used if there is a reason for the negation

2. Testing German Polar Questions

2.1. What is tested?
The section on German polar questions has brought up some questions, which will be investigated by means of the experimental results: Are negations in the third position ambiguous between being of the preposed type and being of the non-preposed type? Do negated polar questions differ regarding the presence of a presupposition of a speaker’s belief? Are kein-questions ambiguous between presupposing and not presupposing a speaker’s belief? In which way are questions with a message like INPQs convey expressed in German? Does the addition of etwa to German negated polar questions help form a question which communicates what English INPQs express? Do the predictions which R&H and B&G suggest for English also hold for German?
The hypotheses to be tested by investigating y/n-questions with transitive verbs:

1. Y/n-questions containing a negation in the position immediately before the verb do not necessarily presuppose a positive belief of the speaker.
2. Negations positioned in the third position are ambiguous between presupposing a positive belief while asking about p and not-presupposing a belief while asking about not-p.
3. Y/n-questions containing a negation in the leftmost position or in the position following the subject presuppose a positive belief of the speaker.
4. In German, the types of negation are not as easily distinguished as in English due to discourse related word order variation.
5. **Y/n-questions comprising kein** are ambiguous between presupposing a positive belief while questioning not-p and carrying no such presupposition while asking about not-p.

6. The particle *etwa* contributes a presupposition of a positive belief to a negated y/n-question.

7. *Auch* does not contribute to whether a question carries a presupposition of a positive belief or not.

### 2.2. Method

In order to investigate the above questions, the participants were asked to rate how well a question fits a particular context. The experiment was based upon the same method as the experiment on English. I will only report of the differences. Again, WebEx2 was used for the experiment of German questions.

#### 2.2.1. Participants

Twenty-four students of the University of Tübingen were recruited with the chance to win €75 for participation. They were all native speakers of German.

#### 2.2.2. Design, Procedure and Material

**Conditions with definite Objects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Context+Speaker’s Belief</th>
<th>Context+No Belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulfills Presup Too, Counter-evidence</td>
<td>Fulfills Presup Too, Counter-evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulfills Presup Either, Counter-evidence</td>
<td>Fulfills Presup Either, Counter-evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question containing nicht auch</td>
<td>First position</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second position</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third position</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions containing auch nicht</td>
<td>Third position: auch nicht</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third position: etwa auch nicht</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions containing nicht without auch</td>
<td>Third position</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
The eight versions of the questionnaire were built from 8 different lexicalizations, 12 different context types and 10 different question types. There were 32 conditions in each lexical item. The contexts were controlled regarding three parameters. For example contexts either consult the appendix or look at the English examples above; the German contexts were mostly constructed along the lines of the English contexts.

Firstly, the contexts varied in terms of whether they would lead to a question with a definite object or an indefinite object. By incorporating questions with an indefinite object, it was possible to test questions with *kein*. Every lexical item was thus split in a *definite* version and an *indefinite* version. There were 20 conditions for the definite case and 12 conditions for the indefinite case. The different conditions with indefinite objects are given in Table 3 and the different conditions with definite objects are given in Table 2.

Furthermore, the contexts differed regarding the **belief state of the speaker** and regarding the **evidence from the current situation**. They either indicated a speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true or stated that the speaker would not have a previous attitude towards the issue. A context either fulfilled the presupposition of *auch nicht* (*either*) or of *auch* (*too*). The contexts, which fulfilled the presupposition of *too*, either provided evidence against the proposition at issue or were neutral.

### Conditions with Indefinite Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context+Speaker’s Belief</th>
<th>Context+No Belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulfills Presup Too, Counter-evidence</td>
<td>Fulfills Presup Too, Counter-evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfills Presup Either, Counter-evidence</td>
<td>Fulfills Presup Either, Counter-evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfills Presup Too, Neutral</td>
<td>Fulfills Presup Either, Counter-evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question with *kein* | x | x | x | x |
| Question with *etwa auch kein* | x | | x |
| Question with *auch kein* | x | | x |
| Question with *nicht auch ein* | x | x | x | x |

**Table 3**

Turning to the appearance of the questions, the questions were controlled regarding three factors. Firstly, they differed regarding the **position of the negation**. All questions were built
with transitive verbs and thus contained three possible positions for the negation in case of a
definite object (99 - 101) and there were two different kinds of negation in case of an
indefinite object (102 - 103). Hence, the second factor was whether they contained a definite
or an indefinite object.

99)  Hat nicht auch Maria die Ausstellung besucht?
    Has not also Maria the exhibition visited?
    Didn’t Maria visit the exhibition too?
100) Hat Maria nicht auch die Ausstellung besucht?
     Has Maria not also the exhibition visited?
        Didn’t Maria visit the exhibition too?
101) Hat Maria die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?
     Has Maria the exhibition not also visited?
        Didn’t Maria visit the exhibition too?

Furthermore, the questions differed in whether they contained nicht auch (too), auch nicht
(either), auch kein (also not) or whether they contained just nicht (not) or kein (no). Auch
always focused on the subject. The subject was always definite. Auch was placed immediately
after the negation within the questions which should parallel the English too-questions (99 -
101). In order to form the question’s analog to the English either-questions, auch scoped over
the negation (104). In the definite case, the combination auch nicht was tested in the position
directly before the verb. In the indefinite case, auch occurred directly before kein (102).

102)  Hat Maria auch keine Ausstellung besucht?
    Has Maria also no exhibition visited?
    Did Maria visit no exhibition too?
103)  Hat Maria nicht auch eine Ausstellung besucht?
     Has Maria not also a exhibition visited?
        Did Maria not visit a exhibition too?
104)  Hat Maria die Ausstellung auch nicht besucht?
     Has Maria the exhibition also not visited?
        Did Maria not visit the exhibition either?
Additionally, the particle *etwa (really/perhaps)* was inserted into an *auch-nicht*-question (105) and into an *auch-kein*-question (107). This was done in order to obtain a question parallel to the English INPQs.

105) Hat Maria die Ausstellung etwa auch nicht besucht?
Has Maria the exhibition really also not visited?
Didn’t Maria visit the exhibition either?

106) Hat Maria etwa auch keine Ausstellung besucht?
Has Maria really also no exhibition visited?
Didn’t Maria visit the exhibition either?

In order to test, whether *auch* contributes anything to the implicature, there was one question without *auch* and with the negation positioned immediately before the verb in the definite case (106). There was one question without *auch* and with *kein* in the indefinite case (107).

107) Hat Maria keine Ausstellung besucht?
Has Maria no exhibition visited?
Did Maria visit no exhibition?

108) Hat Maria die Ausstellung nicht besucht?
Has Maria the exhibition not visited?
Did Maria not visit the exhibition?

A context was combined with a question if they agreed in the usage of either an NPPI or a PPPI: A question with an NPPI was only seen in a context which fulfilled the requirements of an NPPI; a question with a PPPI was only seen in a context which was in accord with a PPPI. Otherwise, a bad rating might have been due to an item of inappropriate polarity. The questions without *auch* were combined with PPPI-contexts and with NPPI-contexts, with and without a positive belief of the speaker in terms of the proposition at issue.

In sum, there were 32 different combinations of context and question for each lexicalization. Each of the eight versions of the questionnaire was seen by a different group of raters. Every group contained between two and four raters. Each version of the questionnaire comprised 32 test combinations of context and question and 8 fillers. Every participant saw each lexical item four times.
2.3. Results

2.3.1. Comments to Figure 2 and Figure 3

*Figure 2* and *Figure 3* illustrate the error-bars for the questions containing definite objects. The x-axis represents the different contexts in the same order as described in the section of the English experiment. On the right hand side beside the figures, there is a legend which gives information about which color represents which question type. Each question type is described by means of an example. The translation and gloss of the examples in the legend of *Figure 2* can be obtained from the examples above:

- **Blue** – 104)
- **Green** – 99)
- **Red** – 100)
- **Purple** – 101)

![Figure 2](image)

*Figure 2*

*Figure 3* represents the results for the questions which were tested in addition: The questions without *auch* and the questions containing *etwa auch nicht*.

- **Blue** – 107)
- **Green** – 108)
2.3.2. Comments to Figure 4

Figure 4 shows the error bars illustrating the normalized values of the ratings of questions with indefinite objects. The x-axis again represents the subdivision in different contexts in the same order as above.

- **Blue** – 107)
- **Green** – 101)
- **Orange** – 105)
- **Purple** – 102)
2.4. Statistics
For the statistics of the German results the same conventions described in the statistics section of the English results hold.

2.4.1. Questions with Definite Objects
While there was no effect in contexts fulfilling the presupposition of *either*, the ratings in the contexts in the middle of Figure 2 increase if the speaker’s belief is present. There is a highly significant main effect of the speaker’s belief ($F_1 (1,23) = 19.866; p < 0.001; F_2 (1,7) = 35.797; p = 0.001$). In an individual view of the questions, the presence of a speaker’s belief has an effect on the green and red questions. T-tests confirmed this effect for questions containing *nicht auch* immediately after the finite verb ($p_1 = 0.004; p_2 = 0.002$) and after the subject ($p_1 < 0.001; p_2 < 0.001$). This indicates that questions containing a negation in the first or second position presuppose the speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true. The German *auch-nicht*-questions do not presuppose a speaker’s belief.

Turning to the questions in neutral contexts, the ratings increase if the context includes the speaker’s belief. The difference between the ratings for questions in contexts with a speaker’s belief and the ratings for questions in contexts without it appears to be significant ($F_1 (1,23) = 11.120; p = 0.003; F_2 (1,7) = 9.397; p = 0.018$). The ratings of the green questions in a context with a speaker’s belief exceeded significantly the ratings of the green questions in a context without it ($p_1 = 0.037; p_2 = 0.016$). The same holds for the red questions ($p_1 = 0.051; p_2 = 0.023$). This is further evidence for the presupposition of a positive speaker’s belief of questions with a negation in the first or second position.

Considering Figure 3, the values of the blue bars on the left hand side of the table increase in case the context contains the speaker’s belief. There was an effect of the presence of a speaker’s belief for questions containing a negation in the third position without *auch* ($p_1 = 0.032; p_2 = 0.037$). Since this effect did not appear in terms of questions containing *auch nicht*, this finding suggests that the *auch* disambiguates the question as being a non-preposed negation question. Furthermore, this is evidence that the negation in the third position can be a preposed negation.
2.4.2. Questions with Indefinite Objects

Let us turn to Figure 4. The only statistical difference obtained by the ANOVA analysis was for the purple questions (nicht-auch-eine-questions) within neutral context. The effect of the presence of the speaker’s belief reached significance ($F_1 (1,23) = 14.475; p < 0.001; F_2 (1,7) = 8.106; p = 0.025$). T-tests for individual questions revealed an effect of the presence of a speaker’s belief for kein-questions containing auch (green) ($p_1 = 0.039; p_2 = 0.023$). If a speaker’s belief was present, the ratings decreased. I take this as indication that kein-questions are not usually used if a speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition.

Finally, ANOVA was conducted in order to investigate kein-questions in contrast to nicht-ein-questions. For comparison, the mean value of the ratings for all kein-questions in contexts with a speaker’s belief, the mean value of the ratings for all kein-questions in contexts without it, the mean value of the ratings of all nicht-ein-questions in contexts with a speaker’s belief and the mean value of the ratings of all nicht-ein-questions in contexts without a speaker’s belief were calculated. We obtained a main effect of negation type – nicht-ein versus kein - ($F_1 (1,23) = 9.241; p = 0.006; F_2 (1,7) = 5.622; p = 0.050$), meaning that the mean rating for nicht-ein-questions exceeded the mean rating for kein-questions in a statistically significant way. I take this as evidence that nicht-ein-questions are generally preferred over kein-questions.

Furthermore, a very significant effect of interaction between negation type and speaker’s belief appeared ($F_1 (1,23) = 19.522; p < 0.001; F_2 (1,7) = 19.435; p = 0.003$). That is, the contribution of a speaker’s belief in the context together with the effect of the negation type (here the appearing preference for nicht-ein-questions) derive an effect, which cannot be explained by the contribution of either of both by itself. It must thus be the interplay of both features, which are responsible for this effect. This is evidence for that nicht and kein are two different kinds of negation. Whereas nicht-questions presuppose the positive speaker’s belief, kein-questions are ‘allergic’ to a positive speaker’s belief.

2.5. Discussion

2.5.1. Results for Questions with a Definite Object

The first impression of the German results is similar to the one of the English results. The ratings of the auch nicht questions (either-equivalents) are not sensitive to the presence of a positive speaker’s belief while the ratings of the questions with nicht auch increase
significantly if the context indicates that the speaker believes in the truth of the positive proposition. I interpret this result such that questions which clearly contain a non-preposed negation (disambiguated by auch scoping over the negation) do not usually convey the speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true. Questions with preposed negation presuppose the positive speaker’s belief.

In case nicht auch occupies the position directly before the infinite verb, there is no effect of the speaker’s belief. Furthermore, the presence of the speaker’s belief had an effect on the ratings of questions containing a negation but no auch in the position directly before the verb in contexts fulfilling the presupposition of auch nicht (either) while the same effect did not appear when the same question was placed in a context which fulfilled the presupposition of auch (too). These finding indicates the ambiguous status of the low negation in German polar questions, which might be due to discourse related word ordering.

Since questions with negation in the third position were felicitous with a positive as well as with a negative polarity item, I assume two different readings for them: questioning the positive proposition and questioning the negative proposition. Furthermore, since preposed negation questions are only possible with positive polarity items and since these questions always convey the speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true, questions with a negation immediately before the infinite verb should be regarded as being ambiguous between questioning the positive proposition while presupposing a positive speaker’s belief and questioning the negative proposition. Consequently, negations in the position directly before the verb should be regarded as being ambiguous between being of the preposed negation type and being of the non-preposed negation type.

Turning to the questions containing etwa, it is interesting that the prediction does not hold. Etwa does not add the presupposition of the speaker’s belief to a question (compare the green bars of Figure 3). Otherwise, there would be an effect of the presence of a speaker’s belief regarding the question type containing etwa. The missing effect, however, suggests that normal negations questions in German, such as questions with auch nicht, do usually not contribute the presupposition of a speaker’s belief.

Even though it seems to me that etwa can contribute the speaker’s belief, it might be counterintuitive for native speakers to ask a negated question while assuming the positive proposition. Because auch disambiguates the negation to be of the non-preposed type, the question clearly inquires about the negative proposition. If a speaker believes in the truth of
the positive proposition but questions the negated proposition, the answer she receives must be highly ambiguous. In this case, it would not be clear whether the reply is an answer to the positive belief or to the negative proposition. It is imaginable that the combination of belief and questioned proposition of complementary polarity is uneconomically and thus marked. Consequently, *etwa*-questions do not receive higher ratings in case there is a speaker’s belief.

Besides, the assumption that German questions containing a non-preposed negation cannot usually convey a positive speaker’s belief is in accord with the data of the English experiment. It had turned out that unambiguously negative questions are insensitive to the presence of a speaker’s belief. Therefore, questions with a normal negation are suggested to not presuppose a speaker’s belief. If in German questions it cannot unambiguously be determined which type of negation is used due to discourse related word order variation, the possible presupposition in case the negation equals *n’t* shows its effects on the ratings.

Additionally, these results suggest that *auch* does not have an effect on the presence of the presupposition of a speaker’s belief. The ratings of questions with *nicht-auch* in the third position do not show a significant sensitivity concerning a speaker’s belief while the ratings of questions with *nicht-auch* in the first or second position do show it. Furthermore, since *auch-nicht* questions are not responsive to the speaker’s belief, there is good reason to assume that *auch* does not contribute the presupposition.

In sum, the hitherto results give rise to the following assumptions: Questions containing a normal negation, which can be uniquely identified as such, do not usually presuppose a speaker’s belief. Questions, containing a negation in the third spot are ambiguous between requiring a speaker’s belief and not-requiring it. Questions which contain a negation in the first or second negation-position presuppose the speaker’s positive belief about p.

- By including the NPPI version of (*etwa*) *auch*, a negation in the third position is disambiguated towards the normal negation type
- Support: Questions with a negation in the first and second spot are sensitive to the presence of a speaker’s belief; questions with a negation in the third spot are not necessarily sensitive to it.
- Refutation: *Etwa* does not contribute the presupposition of a speaker’s belief to questions with normal negation
2.5.2. Results for Questions with an Indefinite Object

The ratings of *kein*-questions do not allow the conclusion that this negation type is ambiguous. Although the green bars in *Figure 4* showed an effect in terms of the factor *speaker’s belief*, the effect indicated that *kein*-questions – in case *auch* precedes *kein* – are less natural if the speaker has a belief about the truth of the positive proposition. *Kein*-questions with *auch* prefer to occur in contexts without a speaker’s belief. Since such a pattern has never occurred in the other experiment, *kein*-questions must be a special case of negated question. There is good reason to assume that the negation in *kein*-questions cannot be of the preposed type because there was no other effect in terms of the ratings of *kein*-questions.

The effect of the speaker’s belief on the ratings of *nicht-auch-ein*-questions does not surprise since there was the same effect for *nicht-auch*-questions in the definite-condition. It was not likely that the definiteness of the object would influence this effect.

In sum, there is an interaction effect of the presence of the speaker’s belief and the negation type (*nicht-ein* versus *kein*). While *kein*-questions are in general not sensitive to the presence of a speaker’s belief, the ratings of *nicht-ein*-questions increase significantly if the context contains a speaker’s belief. The reason for the interaction is that *nicht-ein*-questions do in general presuppose a speaker’s belief, while *kein*-questions usually do not.

The results for *kein*-questions and the finding that the ratings of negated questions do not show an effect if *etwa* is added, provides further evidence that questions containing a negative proposition do not usually presuppose a positive belief of the speaker and that the presupposition of a positive speaker’s belief accompanies the inquiry about the positive proposition. Interestingly, R&H and vR&S assume that negated questions can convey the speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true. It might be the case that negated questions do only convey a positive speaker’s belief if the negation is focused. VR&S suggest that the INPQ reading – questioning not-p while presupposing a positive speaker’s belief – contains focused negation. The questions in this experiment were not controlled for focus, however. We can thus merely speculate about why polar questions, which constitute an inquiry about not-p, are not sensitive to the parameter *speaker’s belief*.

Finally, the overall decrease of the ratings for questions in *Figure 4* in comparison to *Figure 2* might be due to *kein*-questions always containing a negative proposition and thus being
generally marked. Remember that vR&S suggested that positive questions are the default questions. Furthermore, *kein*-questions seem to be a special case anyway if one considers the discussed findings.

- *Kein*-questions seem to constitute a special kind of negated question in comparison to the hitherto investigated polar questions containing a negative marker
- *Kein*-questions do not presuppose a positive speaker’s belief
- *Kein*-questions constantly question the negative proposition
- *Nicht-ein*-questions seem to be generally preferred over *kein*-questions

2.6. Theoretical Consequences
In sum, the effect against a presupposition of a positive belief and the absence of effects in terms of *kein*-questions on the one hand, and the clear effects of the speaker’s belief regarding questions with a negation in the first or second position on the other hand, provide good evidence that German also distinguishes between preposed and non-preposed negation. If there are two positions, which prove the existence of n’t² in German and if there is one concrete type of negation (*kein*) for which it always holds that it is of the *not*-type, there is good reason to assume a theory for German parallel to the English one.

This pattern supports B&G’s typology of polar questions. They suggested that there are two different kinds of negated polar questions: one inquires about the positive proposition and one questions the negative proposition. *Kein*-questions always question the negative proposition and only convey a slight implication. *Nicht-ein*-questions have a stronger implication and question the positive proposition. This is in accord with the experimental results. The only issue which is problematic is the slight implication of *kein*-questions, which B&G want to have observed. This observation might, however, be due to confusing B&G’s proposed felicity conditions for negated questions in general with the presupposition of a general speaker’s belief.

It did not hold that *kein* is ambiguous between two forms of negation. The results suggest that *kein* does not presuppose a positive belief of the speaker, and thus support R&H’s intuitions as opposed to B&G and vR&S’s. Remember that B&G claim *kein*-questions to convey an

---

34 B&G differentiate between a belief of the speaker, which is based on *general* knowledge about the world and a belief, which is based on recently acquired knowledge.
implication, that vR&S find *kein*-questions to be both – INPQs or ONPQ, while R&H find *kein*-questions to contain a negation of the non-preposed type.

Most important points of chapter 2:

- **Support:** Negations in the third position are indicated to be ambiguous between being a \( n^{'t_{\text{InO}}} \) and being of the normal negation type.
- **Support:** Negations in the first and second position are of the \( n^{'t_{\text{InO}}} \) type.
- **Refutation:** *Kein* in questions seems to unambiguously correspond to the normal negation type and does not convey a positive speaker’s belief.
- There is evidence for that German as well as English contains two different types of negation, one of which does not even negate its complement but merely adds a presupposition for a positive speaker’s belief.
- There is evidence for that German patterns alike English so that one theory can represent both languages.
- There is evidence for that B&G’s typology is correct: There are two types of negated polar questions.

3. Summary, Conclusion and Further Research

In this thesis, theories aiming to explain the complexities underlying negated yes/no-questions have been examined. Romero & Han (2004) developed a theoretic framework and introduced the operator *Verum* which provides means to account for the different occurrences of polar questions. Buering & Gunlogson (2000) defined the different types of polar questions on the basis of their contextual requirements and concluded from their findings that semantic theory should account for the diversity of polar questions. Finally, van Roy & Safarova (2003) set up a framework based on decision theory in order to derive a flexible approach to account for the complexities of (negated) y/n-questions without being dependent on certain contextual requirements.

The first important point of this thesis was to argue that the occurrence of polar questions cannot be reduced to certain contexts. A theory which merely investigates and explains the phenomenon of polar question by limiting their emergence to certain contexts will always only partly account for this question type and its features. Polar questions require a more flexible account (vR&S).

Secondly, I demonstrated on the basis of the data of an empirical investigation that there are two disjunctive types of negation, one of which cannot even be said to be a negation: \( n^{'t_{\text{InO}}} \) and *Neg*. The claim that questions containing \( n^{'t} \) are ambiguous was challenged. Furthermore,
the experimental results revealed that negated polar questions are in general not sensitive to the presence of a speaker’s belief in the context. The presupposition of a positive speaker’s belief is a feature of questions comprising $n \not\text{PrO}$. Polar questions containing $n \not\text{PrO}$ question the positive proposition.

Thirdly, the experimental data and also tests with polarity items have proven that English and German pattern in the same way regarding polar questions. English distinguishes $n \not\text{PrO}$ from $\text{Neg}$ by shortening it and attaching it to the auxiliary. German on the other hand, offers more than two possible positions for the negation, perhaps due to discourse related word order variation and it includes a morphologically marked negation $\text{kein}$. This divergence does, however, not contradict the similarities that in both languages there are two different kinds of negation.

In the course of the development of this thesis, some aspects which require further research have emerged. Firstly, this thesis did not deal with polar questions containing focused negation. The investigation of polar questions with focused negation will enhance the understanding of the mechanisms underlying negated polar questions. It will be interesting to observe whether this question type presupposes the speaker’s belief that the positive proposition is true, since the experimental results suggest that negated questions are in general not able to presuppose a positive speaker’s belief. An issue connected to the previous one is the investigation of negated questions with $\text{etwa}$. Negated questions with $\text{etwa}$ did also not give rise to the assumption that these questions presuppose a positive speaker’s belief. Thus, the further examination of the meaning of $\text{etwa}$ might also reveal new findings about negated polar questions. Finally, when I first started with this thesis I had in mind to investigate the different reading possibilities of questions containing a negation as well as the influence of the negation within a question on the meaning of the answers to the questions. Since this thesis only deals with the questions and not with the answers to them, it is only the first part of a larger project left for future research:

German has a possibility to answer negated questions, which a lot of other languages like English and Spanish do not offer. $\text{Doch}$ is not usually used to answer positive questions. It has a notion of objection in it, so that one would rather use it in a situation where the speaker intends to say that the negative proposition of a question asking about not-$p$ is not true and implies that the positive proposition holds.

Of course, $\text{Ja}$ (yes) and $\text{Nein}$ (no) are also possibilities to answer a polar question in German. It is, however, not clear, what $\text{Ja}$ means as an answer to a question containing a negation. It
might mean yes, p holds or it might mean yes, p does not hold. I believe that this ambiguity of a yes-answer in German is connected to the possibility to use doch. I have been told that in Spanish a yes-answer to a negated question always means yes, not-p is true and Spanish does not offer a correspondent to doch. The reasoning is that in German according to my intuitions doch is the most unmarked answer to a negated question if the speaker wants to indicate that p is true. Nein (no) on the contrary is the most unmarked answer to a negated question if the speaker wants to indicate that p is not true. Thus ja (yes) is free to mean both. This is of course just in the realms of speculation and it needs experimental investigation in order to be able to make a valuable statement about the matter. I expect, however, that while in German a yes-answer to a polar question containing a normal negation is ambiguous between yes, p is true and yes, p is not true, in English and in Spanish, this will not be the case and a yes-answer unambiguously means yes, p does not hold.

It should thus be tested what doch exactly means. Secondly, it will be interesting to research into which question triggers which meaning for a certain answer. We have seen that there are two kinds of negation. The question arises in which way this difference affects the meaning of an answer and which type of answer is preferred depending on the negation type used in the question.
4. Appendix: Material

4.1. English

In the following, the four versions of the questionnaire of the English experiment are given.

**Version 1**

"1 1 Pos+I Pos+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class will drink wine." Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club drink wine too?".

"2 2 Pos-I Pos+too" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has not seen the program of talks yet. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is giving a psychology talk." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood giving a talk too?"

"3 3 NegEvP+I Pos+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter knows that they both like to accompany school trips. The vice principal says "Only Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller accompanying the group too?"

"4 4 NegEvP-I Pos+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger doesn't know who was involved. The barman says "Only the deputy sheriff shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff shoot bandits too?"

"5 5 Pos+I PreNeg+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob has heard that Ecuador won their match yesterday. Harry says "Uruguay won 3:1." Bob asks "Didn't Ecuador win their game too?"

"6 6 Pos-I PreNeg+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom doesn't know who will send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle has sent a parcel with gifts." Tom asks "Hasn't my uncle sent presents too?"

"7 7 NegEvP+I PreNeg+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "Only the soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Doesn't the alto memorize her part too?"

"8 8 NegEvP-I PreNeg+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa doesn't know who will be baking cakes. Grandmother says "Your aunt is the only one who is preparing a cake for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Isn't mother baking a cake too?"

"9 9 NegEvN+I PreNeg+e" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class won't drink wine, so we won't need any." Maria asks "Won't the people from the sports club drink wine either?"

"10 10 NegEvN-I PreNeg+e" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has not seen the program of talks yet. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is not giving a talk, so there is no decent psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Isn't Professor Frood giving a talk either?"

"11 11 Pos+I Neg+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter knows that they both like to accompany school trips. The vice principal says "Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller not accompanying the group too?"

"12 12 Pos-I Neg+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger doesn't know who was involved. The barman says "The deputy sheriff shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff not shoot bandits too?"

"13 13 NegEvP+I Neg+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob has heard that Ecuador won their match yesterday. Harry says "Uruguay was the only South American country that won." Bob asks "Did Ecuador not win their game too?".
"6 14 NegEvP-I Neg+too"  Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom doesn't know who will send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "Only my uncle has sent a parcel with presents." Tom asks "Has my uncle not sent presents too?".

"7 15 NegEvN+I Neg+e"  The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "The bass doesn't memorize his part. Only the high voices learn their whole parts." The conductor asks "Does the alto not memorize her part either?".

"8 16 NegEvN-I Neg+e"  The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa doesn't know who will be baking cakes. Grandmother says "Your aunt is not preparing anything for Sunday afternoon, so we'll only have scones." Lisa asks"Is mother not baking a cake either"?

"2 1 Pos+I Pos+too"  Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has heard that Professor Frood is giving a talk on psychology. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is giving a psychology talk." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood giving a talk too?".

"3 2 Pos-I Pos+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter doesn't know whether they like to accompany school trips. The vice principal says "Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller accompanying the group too?".

"4 3 NegEvP+I Pos+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "Only the deputy shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff shoot bandits too?"

"5 4 NegEvP-I Pos+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob hasn't heard yesterday's results yet. Harry says "Uruguay was the only South American country that won." Bob asks "Did Ecuador win their game too?".

"6 5 Pos+I PreNeg+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom has heard that his uncle wanted to send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle has sent a parcel with gifts." Tom asks "Hasn't my uncle sent presents too?".

"7 6 Pos-I PreNeg+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has never worked with them. The manager says "The soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Doesn't the alto memorize her part too?"

"8 7 NegEvP+I PreNeg+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa has heard that her mother will be baking a cake. Grandmother says "Your aunt is the only one who is preparing a cake for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Isn't mother baking a cake too?"

"1 8 NegEvP-I PreNeg+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "Only the people from the pottery class will drink wine". Maria asks "Won't the people from the sports club drink wine too?"

"2 9 NegEvN-I PreNeg+e" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has heard that Professor Frood is giving a talk on psychology. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is not giving a talk, so there is no decent psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Isn't Professor Frood giving a talk either?".

"3 10 NegEvN-I PreNeg+e" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter doesn't know whether they like to accompany school trips. The vice principal says "Mr Miller is not coming on the trip, so we have to organize the excursion ourselves." Peter asks "Isn't Mrs Miller accompanying the group either?"

"4 11 Pos+I Neg+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "The deputy shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff not shoot bandits too?"

"5 12 Pos-I Neg+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob hasn't heard yesterday's results yet. Harry says "Uruguay won 3:1." Bob asks "Did Ecuador not win their game too?".
Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom has heard that his uncle wanted to send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "Only my uncle has sent a parcel with presents." Tom asks "Has my uncle not sent presents too?".

The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has never worked with them. The manager says "Only the soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Does the alto not memorize her part too?".

The Brown family is organizing a family tea. Lisa has heard that her mother will be baking a cake. Grandmother says "Your aunt is not preparing anything for Sunday afternoon, so we'll only have scones." Lisa asks "Is mother not baking a cake either?".

The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "The soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Doesn't the alto memorize her part too?"

Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class won't drink wine, so we won't need any." Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club not drink wine either?".

Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter knows that they both like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller accompanying the group too?"

A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger doesn't know who was involved. The barman says "The deputy sheriff shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff shoot bandits too?"

Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob has heard that Ecuador won their match yesterday. Harry says "Uruguay was the only South American country that won." Bob asks "Did Ecuador win their game too?"

Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom doesn't know who will send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "Only my uncle has sent a parcel with presents." Tom asks "Has my uncle sent presents too?"

The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "The soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Doesn't the alto memorize her part too?"

The Brown family is organizing a family tea for Sunday afternoon. Lisa doesn't know who will be baking cakes. Grandma says "Your aunt is preparing a fruit flan for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Isn't mother baking a cake too?"

Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "Only the people from the pottery class will drink wine." Maria asks "Won't the people from the sports club drink wine too?"

Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has not seen the program of talks yet. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is the only psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Isn't Professor Frood giving a talk too?"
manage to shoot any bandits, so they all got away." The gold digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits either?"

"5 11 Pos+I Neg+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob has heard that Ecuador won their match yesterday. Harry says "Uruguay won 3:1." Bob asks "Did Ecuador not win their game too?"

"6 12 Pos-I Neg+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom doesn't know who will send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle has sent a parcel with gifts." Tom asks "Has my uncle not sent presents too?"

"7 13 NegEvP+I Neg+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "Only the soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Does the alto not memorize her part too?"

"8 14 NegEvP-I Neg+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea for Sunday afternoon. Lisa doesn't know who will be baking cakes. Grandma says "Your aunt is the only one who is preparing a cake for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Is mother not baking a cake too?"

"1 15 NegEvN+I Neg+e" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class won't drink wine, so we won't need any." Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club not drink wine either?"

"2 16 NegEvN-I Neg+e" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has not seen the program of talks yet. Jane "Dr Bedlam is not giving a talk, so there is no decent psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood not giving a talk either?"

"4 1 Pos+I Pos+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "The deputy shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff shoot bandits too?"

"5 2 Pos-I Pos+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob hasn't heard yesterday's results yet. Harry says "Uruguay won 3:1." Bob asks "Did Ecuador win their game too?"

"6 3 NegEvP+I Pos+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom has heard that his uncle wanted to send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "Only my uncle has sent a parcel with presents." Tom asks "Has my uncle sent presents too?"

"7 4 NegEvP-I Pos+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has never worked with them. The manager says "Only the soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Does the alto memorize her part too?"

"8 5 Pos+I PreNeg+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa has heard that her mother will be baking a cake. Grandma says "Your aunt is preparing a fruit flan for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Isn't mother baking a cake too?"

"1 6 Pos-I PreNeg+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class will drink wine." Maria asks "Won't the people from the sports club drink wine too?"

"2 7 NegEvP+I PreNeg+too" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has heard that Professor Frood is giving a talk on psychology. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is the only psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Isn't Professor Frood giving a talk too?"

"3 8 NegEvP-I PreNeg+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter doesn't know whether they like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Only Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Isn't Mrs Miller accompanying the group too?"

"4 9 NegEvN+I PreNeg+e" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "The deputy didn't
manage to shoot any bandits, so they all got away." The gold digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits either?"

"5 10 NegEvN-I PreNeg+e" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob hasn't heard yesterday's results yet. Harry says "Uruguay didn't win, so no South America team won yesterday." Bob asks "Didn't Ecuador win their game either?"

"6 11 Pos+I Neg+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom has heard that his uncle wanted to send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle has sent a parcel with gifts." Tom asks "Has my uncle not sent presents too?"

"7 12 Pos-I Neg+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has never worked with them. The manager says "The soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Does the alto not memorize her part too?"

"8 13 NegEvP+I Neg+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa has heard that her mother will be baking a cake. Grandma says "Your aunt is the only one who is preparing a cake for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Is mother not baking a cake too?"

"1 14 NegEvP-I Neg+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "Only the people from the pottery class will drink wine." Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club not drink wine too?"

"2 15 NegEvN+I Neg+e" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has heard that Professor Frood is giving a talk on psychology. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is not giving a talk, so there is no decent psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood not giving a talk either?"

"3 16 NegEvN-I Neg+e" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter doesn't know whether they like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Mr Miller is not coming on the trip, so we have to organize the excursion ourselves." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller not accompanying the group either?"

Version 3

"5 1 Pos+I Pos+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob has heard that Ecuador won their match yesterday. Harry says "Uruguay won 3:1." Bob asks "Did Ecuador win their game too?"

"6 2 Pos-I Pos+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom doesn't know who will send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle has sent a parcel with gifts." Tom asks "Has my uncle sent presents too?"

"7 3 NegEvP+I Pos+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "Only the soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Does the alto memorize her part too?"

"8 4 NegEvP-I Pos+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa doesn't know who will be baking cakes. Grandma says "Your aunt is the only one who is preparing a cake for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Is mother baking a cake too?"

"1 5 Pos+I PreNeg+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class will drink wine." Maria asks "Won't the people from the sports club drink wine too?"

"2 6 Pos-I PreNeg+too" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has not seen the program of talks yet. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is giving a psychology talk." Pat asks "Isn't Professor Frood giving a talk too?"
"3 7 NegEvP+I PreNeg+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter knows that they both like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Only Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Isn't Mrs Miller accompanying the group too?"

"4 8 NegEvP-I PreNeg+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger doesn't know who was involved. The barman says "Only the deputy sheriff shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits too?"

"5 9 NegEvN+I PreNeg+e" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob has heard that Ecuador won their match yesterday. Harry says "Uruguay didn't win, so no South America team won yesterday." Bob asks "Didn't Ecuador win their game either?"

"6 10 NegEvN-I PreNeg+e" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom doesn't know who will send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle hasn't sent anything for the baby, I was expecting some presents." Tom asks "Hasn't my uncle sent presents either?"

"7 11 Pos+I Neg+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "The soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Does the alto not memorize her part too?"

"8 12 Pos-I Neg+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa doesn't know who will be baking cakes. Grandma says "Your aunt is preparing a fruit flan for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Is mother not baking a cake too?"

"9 13 NegEvP+I Neg+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "Only the people from the pottery class will drink wine". Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club not drink wine too?"

"10 14 NegEvP-I Neg+too" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has not seen the program of talks yet. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is the only psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood not giving a talk too?"

"11 15 NegEvN+I Neg+e" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter knows that they both like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Mr Miller is not coming on the trip, so we have to organize the excursion ourselves." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller not accompanying the group either?"

"12 16 NegEvN-I Neg+e" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger doesn't know who was involved. The barman says "The deputy sheriff didn't manage to shoot any bandits, so they all got away." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff not shoot bandits either?"

"13 1 Pos+I Pos+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom has heard that his uncle wanted to send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle has sent a parcel with gifts." Tom asks "Has my uncle sent presents too?"

"14 2 Pos-I Pos+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has never worked with them. The manager says "The soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Does the alto memorize her part too?"

"15 3 NegEvP+I Pos+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa has heard that her mother will be baking a cake. Grandma says "Your aunt is the only one who is preparing a cake for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Is mother baking a cake too?"

"16 4 NegEvP-I Pos+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "Only the people from the pottery class will drink wine". Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club drink wine too?"

"17 5 Pos+I PreNeg+too" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has heard that Professor Frood is giving a talk on psychology. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is giving a psychology talk." Pat asks "Isn't Professor Frood giving a talk too?"
"3 6 Pos-I PreNeg+too"  Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter doesn't know whether they like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Isn't Mrs Miller accompanying the group too?"

"4 7 NegEvP+I PreNeg+too"  A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "Only the deputy shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits too?"

"5 8 NegEvP-I PreNeg+too"  Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob hasn't heard yesterday's results yet. Harry says "Uruguay was the only South American country that won." Bob asks "Didn't Ecuador win their game too?"

"6 9 NegEvN+I PreNeg+e" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom has heard that his uncle wanted to send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle hasn't sent anything for the baby, I was expecting some presents." Tom asks "Hasn't my uncle sent presents either?"

"7 10 NegEvN-I PreNeg+e"  The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has never worked with them. The manager says "The bass doesn't memorize his part. Only the high voices learn their whole parts." The conductor asks "Doesn't the alto memorize her part either?"

"8 11 Pos+I Neg+too"  The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa has heard that her mother will be baking a cake. Grandma says "Your aunt is preparing a fruit flan for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Is mother not baking a cake too?"

"9 12 Pos-I Neg+too"  Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class will drink wine". Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club not drink wine too?"

"10 13 NegEvP+I Neg+too"  Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has heard that Professor Frood is giving a talk on psychology. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is the only psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood not giving a talk too?"

"11 14 NegEvP-I Neg+too"  Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter doesn't know whether they like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Only Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller not accompanying the group too?"

"12 15 NegEvN+I Neg+e"  A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "The deputy didn't manage to shoot any bandits, so they all got away." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff not shoot bandits either?"

"13 16 NegEvN-I Neg+e"  Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob hasn't heard yesterday's results yet. Harry says "Uruguay didn't win, so no South America team won yesterday." Bob asks "Did Ecuador not win their game either?"


Version 4

"7 1 Pos+I Pos+too"  The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "The soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Does the alto memorize her part too?"

"8 2 Pos-I Pos+too"  The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa doesn't know who will be baking cakes. Grandma says "Your aunt is preparing a fruit flan for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Is mother baking a cake too?"
"1 3 NegEvP+I Pos+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "Only the people from the pottery class will drink wine". Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club drink wine too?"

"2 4 NegEvP-I Pos+too" Pat and are attending a conference. Pat has not seen the program of talks yet. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is the only psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood giving a talk too?"

"3 5 Pos+I PreNeg+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter knows that they both like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Isn't Mrs Miller accompanying the group too?"

"4 6 Pos-I PreNeg+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger doesn't know who was involved. The barman says "The deputy sheriff shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits too?"

"5 7 NegEvP+I PreNeg+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob has heard that Ecuador won their match yesterday. Harry says "Uruguay was the only South American country that won." Bob asks "Didn't Ecuador win their game too?"

"6 8 NegEvP-I PreNeg+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom doesn't know who will send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "Only my uncle has sent a parcel with presents." Tom asks "Hasn't my uncle sent presents too?"

"7 9 NegEvN+I PreNeg+e" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has heard that the alto prepares very well. The manager says "The bass doesn't memorize his part. Only the high voices learn their whole parts." The conductor asks "Doesn't the alto memorize her part either?"

"8 10 NegEvN-I PreNeg+e" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa doesn't know who will be baking cakes. Grandma says "Your aunt is not preparing anything for Sunday afternoon, so we'll only have scones." Lisa asks "Isn't mother baking a cake either?"

"9 11 Pos+I Neg+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria has heard that the people from the sports club like drinking wine. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class will drink wine". Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club drink wine too?"

"10 12 Pos+I Neg+too" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has not seen the program of talks yet. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is giving a psychology talk." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood not giving a talk too?"

"11 13 NegEvP+I Neg+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter knows that they both like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Only Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller not accompanying the group too?"

"12 14 NegEvP-I Neg+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger doesn't know who was involved. The barman says "Only the deputy sheriff shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff not shoot bandits too?"

"13 15 NegEvN+I Neg+e" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob has heard that Ecuador won their match yesterday. Harry says "Uruguay didn't win, so no South America team won yesterday." Bob asks "Did Ecuador not win their game either?"

"14 16 NegEvN-I Neg+e" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom doesn't know who will send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle hasn't sent anything for the baby, I was expecting some presents." Tom asks "Has my uncle not sent presents either?"

"15 17 Pos+I Pos+too" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa has heard that her mother will be baking a cake. Grandma says "Your aunt is preparing a fruit flan for Sunday afternoon." Lisa asks "Is mother baking a cake too?"

"16 18 Pos-I Pos+too" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class will drink wine". Maria asks "Will the people from the sports club drink wine too?"
"2 3 NegEvP+I Pos+too" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has heard that Professor Frood is giving a talk on psychology. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is the only psychologist on the program." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood giving a talk too?"
"3 4 NegEvP-I Pos+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter doesn't know whether they like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Only Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller accompanying the group too?"
"4 5 Pos+I PreNeg+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "The deputy shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Didn't the sheriff shoot bandits too?"
"5 6 Pos-I PreNeg+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob hasn't heard yesterday's results yet. Harry says "Uruguay won 3:1." Bob asks "Didn't Ecuador win their game too?"
"6 7 NegEvP+I PreNeg+too" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom has heard that his uncle wanted to send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "Only my uncle has sent a parcel with presents." Tom asks "Hasn't my uncle sent presents too?"
"7 8 NegEvP-I PreNeg+too" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has never worked with them. The manager says "Only the soprano learns her whole part before the rehearsal." The conductor asks "Doesn't the alto memorize her part too?"
"8 9 NegEvN+I PreNeg+e" The Brown family is organizing a big family tea. Lisa has heard that her mother will be baking a cake. Grandma says "Your aunt is not preparing anything for Sunday afternoon, so we'll only have scones." Lisa asks "Isn't mother baking a cake either?"
"9 10 NegEvN-I PreNeg+e" Maria and Hanna are planning a party. Maria doesn't know what the people from the sports club drink. Hanna says "The people from the pottery class won't drink wine, so we won't need any." Maria asks "Won't the people from the sports club drink wine either?"
"2 11 Pos+I Neg+too" Pat and Jane are attending a conference. Pat has heard that Professor Frood is giving a talk on psychology. Jane says "Dr Bedlam is giving a psychology talk." Pat asks "Is Professor Frood not giving a talk too?"
"3 12 Pos-I Neg+too" Jack and Jill Miller are teachers. The student Peter doesn't know whether they like to accompany school trips. The vice-principal says "Mr Miller is coming on the trip." Peter asks "Is Mrs Miller not accompanying the group too?"
"4 13 NegEvP+I Neg+too" A gold digger is talking to the barman about a shooting. The gold digger has heard that the sheriff shot some bandits. The barman says "Only the deputy shot bandits yesterday." The gold digger asks "Did the sheriff not shoot bandits too?"
"5 14 NegEvP-I Neg+too" Bob and Harry are discussing the World Cup. Bob hasn't heard yesterday's results yet. Harry says "Uruguay was the only South American country that won." Bob asks "Did Ecuador not win their game too?"
"6 15 NegEvN+I Neg+e" Sarah and Tom have a new baby. Tom has heard that his uncle wanted to send presents for the baby. When he comes home, Sarah says "My uncle hasn't sent anything for the baby, I was expecting some presents." Tom asks "Has my uncle not sent presents either?"
"7 16 NegEvN-I Neg+e" The manager is telling the new conductor about the soloists. The conductor has never worked with them. The manager says "The bass doesn't memorize his part. Only the high voices learn their whole parts." The conductor asks "Does the alto not memorize her part either?"
The nurse is interested in people who don't like coffee. When she meets a doctor drinking a cup of tea, she asks him "Do you like coffee?"

The nurse is interested in people who don't like coffee. When she meets a doctor drinking a cup of tea, she asks him "Do you not like coffee?"

Carlos is doing a study about what sort of people don't eat sweets. A friend says "My sister never eats sweets." Carlos asks "What about your brother - does he not eat sweets?"

Carlos is doing a study about what sort of people don't eat sweets. A friend says "My sister never eats sweets." Carlos asks "What about your brother - does he eat sweets?"

The scientist wants to find out whether people who don't smoke are happier than people who do smoke. He meets a girl in a smoker's pub who is currently not smoking. He asks her "Do you not smoke cigarettes?"

The scientist wants to find out whether people who don't smoke are happier than people who do smoke. He meets a girl in a smoker's pub who is currently not smoking. He asks her "Do you usually smoke cigarettes?"

The publisher finds it fascinating when people don't keep their promises. The editor complains that an author has not sent him his manuscript. The publisher inquires "Did the author not promise the document?"

The animal rights activist is interested in people who are vegetarians. He comes by a group of people who have everything but meat on their grill. He asks them "Don't you eat any meat?"

The uncle enjoys baking cakes and biscuits, because she thinks they make you happier. She asks everybody from the family "Don't you never enjoy something sweet?"

Sally and Ana are looking for a third house mate. They want to find out how tidy the applicant is. They ask her "Have you ever washed your dishes?"

4.2. German
In the following, the eight versions of the questionnaire of the German experiment are given.

**Version 1**

"1 1 Neu+I Pre1+D+na"  
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung hat uns finanzielle Mittel versprochen.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch das Land die Förderung bewilligt?"

"1 9 NegEp+I Pre3+D+na"  
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist..."
die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er  "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht auch bewilligt?"
"1 17 NegEp-I N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er  "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"
"1 25 NegEn-I K+l"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß, dass das Land finanzielle Mittel zugestehen wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine Gelder - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er  "Hat das Land keine Förderung bewilligt?"
"2 2 Neu+I Pre2+D+na"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er  "Wird dein Vater nicht auch den Wettbewerb bestreiten?"
"2 10 NegEp+I N+D"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin ist die einzige vom Stall, die an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird.", fragt er  "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht bestreiten?"
"2 18 NegEn-I N+D+an"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Mir gefällt diese Art von Krimi nicht - wer liest so etwas schon?", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund den Krimi auch nicht lesen?"

Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat noch nichts davon gehört. Als Ina sagt "Mir gefällt diese Art von Krimi nicht - wer liest so etwas schon?", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund den Krimi etwa auch nicht lesen?"

Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat keine Ahnung, was Ina und ihr Freund gerne lesen. Als Ina sagt "Ich bin die einzige bei uns, die einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen wird.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"

Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird den Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin nicht auch das Lied singen?"

Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent glaubt, dass die Sekretärin den Song singen wird. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird das Lied nicht vorstellen – niemand traut sich an dieses Musikstück heran.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin das Lied etwa auch nicht singen?"

Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent hat gehört, dass die Sekretärin ein Musikstück zum Besten geben wird. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin kein Lied singen?"

Zwei Polizisten sprechen über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat noch nichts von diesem Gangster gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat den Kerl verhört.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor den Verbrecher nicht auch vernommen?"

Zwei Polizisten sprechen über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat noch nichts von diesem Gangster gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Inspektor den Verbrecher vernommen?"

Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat einen Gangster verhört.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch einen Verbrecher vernommen?"

Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt – keiner hat Lust, mit diesen Gangstern zu reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor keinen Verbrecher vernommen?"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat den Knaben geschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Studienrat den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"
"7 15 NegEp-I Pre2+D+na"

Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine weiß nicht, wer den Knaben gemäßregelt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat nicht auch den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"
"7 23 NegEp+I Pre2+I+na"

Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat einen Schüler deshalb richtig ausgeschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor ist der einzige, der Streiche bestraft hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat nicht auch einen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"
"7 31 NegEn-I K+I+a"

Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine weiß nichts über die Strafmaßnahmen. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor hat keinen Schüler zurechtgewiesen – die kommen alle mit ihrem schlechten Benehmen davon.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat auch keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"
"8 8 NegEp+I Pre2+D+na"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn nicht auch die Ausstellung besucht?"
"8 16 NegEp-I Pre3+D+na"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta weiß nicht, ob Lisas kunstbegeisterter Sohn in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?"
"8 24 NegEp+I K+I"

Marta und Lisa besprechen die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in einer Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Nur unsere Kusine hat sich mit Kunst beschäftigt.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn keine Ausstellung besucht?"
"8 32 NegEn-I K+I+ea"

Marta und Lisa besprechen die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta weiß nicht, was Lisas kunstbegeisterter Sohn gemacht hat. Als Lisa sagt "Nicht einmal unsere Kusine war in einem Kunstmuseum – niemand konnte mir über laufende Ausstellungen berichten.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn etwa auch keine Ausstellung besucht?"

Version 2

"1 2 Neu+I Pre2+D+na"

Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung hat uns finanzielle Mittel versprochen.", fragt er "Hat das Land nicht auch die Förderung bewilligt?"
"1 10 NegEp+I N+D"

Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist
die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"
"1 18 NegEn-I N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine finanziellen Mittel - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"
"1 26 NegEn+I K+I+a"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine Gelder - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land auch keine Förderung bewilligt?"
"2 3 Neu+I Pre3+D+na"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht auch bestreiten?"
"2 11 NegEn+I N+D"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht bestreiten?"
"2 19 NegEn-I N+D+an"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel weiß nicht, wer auf das Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb auch nicht bestreiten?"
"2 27 NegEn+I K+I+ea"
Julia und Daniel unterhalten sich über die Reitturniere am Wochenende. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater auf ein Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an keinem Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist nirgends vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater etwa auch keinen Wettbewerb bestreiten?"
"3 4 Neu-I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat mir dieses Werk ans Herz gelegt.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Professor das Buch empfohlen?"
"3 12 NegEn+I N+D+an"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Professor das Buch vorgeschlagen hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch auch nicht empfohlen?"
"3 20 NegEn-I N+D+ean"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch etwa auch nicht empfohlen?"
"3 28 NegEp-I N+I+na"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Seminar. Der eine hat noch von keinem Literaturvorschlag dazu gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor ist der einzige, der ein Buch empfohlen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Professor nicht auch ein Buch empfohlen?"
"4 5 Neu-I Pre2+D+na"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat noch nichts
von gehört. Als Ina sagt "Ich freue mich auf die neuen Abenteuer des Kommissar Sulzmann.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch den Krimi lesen?"

"4 13 NegEn+I N+D+ean"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Mir gefällt diese Art von Krimi nicht - wer liest so etwas schon?", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund den Krimi etwa auch nicht lesen?"

"4 21 Neu+I Pre2+I+na"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Ich werde wohl einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"

"5 6 Neu-I Pre3+D+na"
Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird den Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin das Lied nicht auch singen?"

"5 14 NegEp-I Pre1+D+na"
Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter ist wohl die einzige, die sich traut, den Song vorzutragen.", fragt er "Wird nicht auch die Sekretärin das Lied singen?"

"5 22 Neu-I Pre2+I+na"
Der Chef und Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin nicht auch ein Lied singen?"

"5 30 NegEn-I K+I"
Der Chef und Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin kein Lied singen?"

"6 7 NegEp+I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Inspektor den Gangster befragt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt war der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Inspektor den Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 15 NegEp-I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat noch nichts von diesem Gangster gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch den Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 23 NegEp+I Pre2+I+na"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege hat gehört, dass der Inspektor einen Verbrecher befragt hat. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der einen Gangster verhörte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch einen Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 31 NegEn-I K+I+na"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für
die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt - keiner will mit diesen Gangstern reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch keinen Verbrecher vernommen?"

"7 8 NegEp+I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat den Knaben geschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht auch ausgeschimpft?"

"7 16 NegEp-I Pre3+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine weiß nicht, wer den Knaben gemäßregelt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat nicht auch den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"7 24 NegEp+I K+I"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat einen Schüler deshalb richtig ausgeschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor ist der einzige, der Streiche bestraft hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"7 32 NegEn-I K+I+ea"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine weiß nichts über die Strafmaßnahmen. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor hat keinen Schüler zurechtgewiesen - die kommen alle mit ihrem schlechten Benehmen davon.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat etwa auch keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"8 1 Neu+I Pre1+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine hat die Bilderauswahl sehr gemocht.", fragt sie "Hat nicht auch dein Sohn die Ausstellung besucht?"

"8 9 NegEp+I Pre3+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?"

"8 17 NegEp+I N+D"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta weiß nicht, ob Lisas kunstbegeisterter Sohn in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht besucht?"

"8 25 NegEn+I K+I"
Marta und Lisa besprechen die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in einer Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Nicht einmal unsere Kusine war in einem Kunstmuseum - niemand konnte mir über laufende Ausstellungen berichten.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn keine Ausstellung besucht?"

**Version 3**

"1 2 Neu+I Pre2+D+na"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung hat uns finanzielle Mittel versprochen.", fragt er "Hat das Land nicht auch die Förderung bewilligt?"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine finanziellen Mittel - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land finanzielle Mittel bewilligen wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an keinem Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist nirgends vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater etwa auch keinen Wettbewerb bestreiten?"

Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb auch nicht bestreiten?"

Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht bestreiten?"

Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel weiß nicht, wer auf das Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an keinem Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist nirgends vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater etwa auch keinen Wettbewerb bestreiten?"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat mir dieses Werk ans Herz gelegt.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Professor das Buch empfohlen?"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Professor das Buch vorgeschlagen hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch auch nicht empfohlen?"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Seminar. Der eine hat noch von keinem Literaturvorschlag dazu gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor ist der einzige, der ein Buch
empfohlen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Professor nicht auch ein Buch empfohlen?"
"4 5 Neu-I Pre2+D+na"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat noch nichts
davon gehört. Als Ina sagt "Ich freue mich auf die neuen Abenteuer des Kommissar
Sulzmann.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch den Krimi lesen?"
"4 13 NegEn+I N+D+ean"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat gehört, dass
Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Mir gefällt diese Art von Krimi
nicht - wer liest so etwas schon?!", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund den Krimi etwa auch
nicht lesen?"
"4 21 Neu+I Pre2+I+na"
Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund einen
Krimi lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Ich freue mich auf die neuen Abenteuer des Kommissar
Sulzmann.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"
"4 29 NegEp-I K+I"
Ina und Claudia besprechen ihren Urlaub. Claudia hat keine Ahnung, was Ina und ihr
Freund gerne lesen. Als Ina sagt "Ich bin die einzige bei uns, die einen Kriminalroman
mitnehmen wird.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund keinen Krimi lesen?"
"5 6 Neu-I Pre3+D+na"
Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der
Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine
Tochter wird den Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin das Lied nicht auch
singen?"
"5 14 NegEp-I Pre1+D+na"
Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der
Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine
Tochter ist wohl die einzige, die sich traut, den Song vorzutragen.", fragt er "Wird nicht auch
die Sekretärin das Lied singen?"
"5 22 Neu-I Pre2+I+na"
Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen
Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.",
fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin nicht auch ein Lied singen?"
"5 30 NegEn-I K+I"
Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen
Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen -
es wird keine Gesangseinlage geben.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin kein Lied singen?"
"6 7 NegEp+I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat gehört, dass der
Inspektor den Gangster befragt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt war der einzige,
der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Inspektor den Verbrecher
vernommen?"
"6 15 NegEp-I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat noch nichts von diesem
Gangster gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der sich ein Verhör
antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch den Verbrecher vernommen?"
"6 23 NegEp+I Pre2+I+na"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege hat gehört, dass der
Inspektor einen Verbrecher befragt hat. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der
einzige, der einen Gangster verhört hat.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch einen
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt - keiner will mit diesen Gangstern reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch keinen Verbrecher vernommen?"

Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat den Knaben geschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat nicht auch den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine weiß nicht, wer den Knaben gemaßregelt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat nicht auch den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat einen Schüler deshalb richtig ausgeschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor ist der einzige, der Streiche bestraft hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht auch ausgeschimpft?"

Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine weiß nichts über die Strafmaßnahmen. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor hat keinen Schüler zurechtgewiesen - die kommen alle mit ihrem schlechten Benehmen davon.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht auch ausgeschimpft?"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine hat die Bilderauswahl sehr gemocht.", fragt sie "Hat nicht auch dein Sohn die Ausstellung besucht?"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta weiß nicht, ob Lisas kunstbegeisterter Sohn in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht besucht?"

Marta und Lisa besprechen die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in einer Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Nicht einmal unsere Kusine war in einem Kunstmuseum - niemand konnte mir über laufende Ausstellungen berichten.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn keine Ausstellung besucht?"

Version 4

"1 2 Neu+I Pre2+D+na"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung hat uns finanzielle Mittel versprochen.", fragt er "Hat das Land nicht auch die Förderung bewilligt?"

"1 10 NegEp+I N+D"

Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

"1 18 NegEn-I N+D"

Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährte keine finanziellen Mittel - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

"1 26 NegEn+I K+I+a"

Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht auch bestreiten?"

"2 11 NegEn+I N+D+an"

Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht bestreiten?"

"2 19 NegEn-I N+D+ean"

Julia und Daniel unterhalten sich über die Reitturniere am Wochenende. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater auf ein Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an keinem Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist nirgends vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater etwa auch keinen Wettbewerb bestreiten?"

"3 4 Neu-I Pre1+D+na"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat mir dieses Werk ans Herz gelegt.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Professor das Buch empfohlen?"

"3 12 NegEn+I N+D+an"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob der Professor das Buch vorgeschlagen hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch auch nicht empfohlen?"

"3 20 NegEn-I N+D+ean"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem
Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch etwa auch nicht empfohlen?"
"3 28 NegEp-I N+1+na"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Seminar. Der eine hat noch von keinem Literaturvorschlag dazu gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor ist der einzige, der ein Buch empfohlen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Professor nicht auch ein Buch empfohlen?"
"4 5 Neu-I Pre2+D+na"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat noch nichts davon gehört. Als Ina sagt "Ich freue mich auf die neuen Abenteuer des Kommissar Sulzmann.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch den Krimi lesen?"
"4 13 NegEn+I N+D+ean"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Mir gefällt diese Art von Krimi nicht - wer liest so etwas schon?", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund den Krimi etwa auch nicht lesen?"
"4 21 Neu+I Pre2+I+na"
Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund einen Krimi lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Ich werde wohl einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"
"4 29 NegEp-I K+I"
Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat keine Ahnung, was Ina und ihr Freund gerne lesen. Als Ina sagt "Ich bin die einzige bei uns, die einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen wird.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund keinen Krimi lesen?"
"5 6 Neu-I Pre3+D+na"
Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird den Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin das Lied nicht auch singen?"
"5 14 NegEp-I Pre1+D+na"
Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter ist wohl die einzige, die sich traut, den Song vorzutragen.", fragt er "Wird nicht auch die Sekretärin das Lied singen?"
"5 22 Neu-I Pre2+I+na"
Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin nicht auch ein Lied singen?"
"5 30 NegEn-I K+I"
Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird keinen Song vortragen - es wird keine Gesangseinlage geben.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin kein Lied singen?"
"6 7 NegEp+I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Inspektor den Gangster befragt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt war der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Inspektor den Verbrecher vernommen?"
"6 15 NegEp-I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat noch nichts von diesem Gangster gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch den Verbrecher vernommen?"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege hat gehört, dass der Inspektor einen Verbrecher befragt hat. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der einen Gangster verhört hat.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch einen Verbrecher vernommen?"

Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt - keiner will mit diesen Gangstern reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch keinen Verbrecher vernommen?"

Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat den Knaben geschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat nicht auch den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine weiß nicht, wer den Knaben gemäßregelt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht ausgeschimpft?"

Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreicherei des Halbjahres. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat einen Schüler deshalb richtig ausgeschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht ausgeschimpft?"

Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreicherei des Halbjahres. Der eine weiß nichts über die Strafmaßnahmen. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor hat keinen Schüler zurechtgewiesen - die kommen alle mit ihrem schlechten Benehmen davon.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat etwa auch keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine hat die Bilderauswahl sehr gemocht.", fragt sie "Hat nicht auch dein Sohn die Ausstellung besucht?"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta weiß nicht, ob Lisas kunstbegeistertes Kind in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht besucht?"

Marta und Lisa besprechen die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in einer Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Nicht einmal unsere Kusine war in einem Kunstmuseum - niemand konnte mir über laufende Ausstellungen berichten.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn keine Ausstellung besucht?"
Version 5

"I 2 Neu+I Pre2+D+na"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die notigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung hat uns finanzielle Mittel versprochen.", fragt er "Hat das Land nicht auch die Förderung bewilligt?"

"I 10 NegEp+I N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die notigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

"I 18 NegEn-I N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine finanziellen Mittel - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

"I 26 NegEn+I K+I+ea"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land finanzielle Mittel bewilligen wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine Gelder - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land auch keine Förderung bewilligt?"

"2 3 Neu+I Pre3+D+na"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht auch bestreiten?"

"2 11 NegEn+I N+D"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht bestreiten?"

"2 19 NegEn-I N+D+an"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel weiß nicht, wer auf das Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb auch nicht bestreiten?"

"2 27 NegEn+I K+I+ea"
Julia und Daniel unterhalten sich über die Reitturniere am Wochenende. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater auf ein Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an keinem Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist nirgends vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater etwa auch keinen Wettbewerb bestreiten?"

"3 4 Neu-I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat mir dieses Werk ans Herz gelegt.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Professor das Buch empfohlen?"

"3 12 NegEn+I N+D+an"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Professor das Buch vorgeschlagen hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch auch nicht
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch etwa auch nicht empfohlen?"

"3 28 NegEp-I N+I na"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Seminar. Der eine hat noch von keinem Literaturvorschlag dazu gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor ist der einzige, der ein Buch empfohlen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Professor nicht auch ein Buch empfohlen?"

"4 Neu-I Pre2+D+na"

Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat noch nichts davon gehört. Als Ina sagt "Ich freue mich auf die neuen Abenteuer des Kommissar Sulzmann.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch den Krimi lesen?"

"4 13 NegEn+I N+D+ean"

Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Ich werde wohl einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"

"4 21 Neu+I Pre2+I+na"

Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund einen Krimi lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Ich werde wohl einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"

"4 29 NegEp-I K+I"

Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat keine Ahnung, was Ina und ihr Freund gerne lesen. Als Ina sagt "Ich bin die einzige bei uns, die einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen wird.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund einen Krimi lesen?"

"5 6 Neu-I Pre3+D+na"

Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird den Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin das Lied nicht auch singen?"

"5 14 NegEp-I Pre1+D+na"

Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter ist wohl die einzige, die sich traut, den Song vorzutragen.", fragt er "Wird nicht auch die Sekretärin das Lied singen?"

"5 22 Neu-I Pre2+I+na"

Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin nicht auch ein Lied singen?"

"5 30 NegEn-I K+I"

Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird keinen Song vortragen - es wird keine Gesangseinlage geben.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin kein Lied singen?"

"6 7 NegEp+I Pre1+D+na"

Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Inspektor den Gangster befragt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt war der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Inspektor den Verbrecher vernommen?"
"6 15 NegEp-I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat noch nichts von diesem Gangster gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch den Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 23 NegEp-I Pre2+I+na"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege hat gehört, dass der Inspektor einen Verbrecher befragt hat. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der einen Gangster verhörte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch einen Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 31 NegEn-I K+I+a"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt - keiner will mit diesen Gangstern reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch keinen Verbrecher vernommen?"

"7 8 NegEp+I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat den Knaben geschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler auch ausgeschimpft?"

"7 16 NegEp-I Pre3+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine weiß nicht, wer den Knaben gemaßregelt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht auch ausgeschimpft?"

"7 24 NegEp+I K+I"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat einen Schüler deshalb richtig ausgeschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor ist der einzige, der Streiche bestraft hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"7 32 NegEn-I K+I+ea"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine weiß nichts über die Strafmaßnahmen. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor hat keinen Schüler zurechtgewiesen - die kommen alle mit ihrem schlechten Benehmen davon.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat etwa auch keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"8 1 Neu+I Pre1+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine hat die Bilderauswahl sehr gemocht.", fragt sie "Hat nicht auch dein Sohn die Ausstellung besucht?"

"8 9 NegEp+I Pre3+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?"

"8 17 NegEp-I N+D"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta weiß nicht, ob Lisas kunstbegeisterter Sohn in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht besucht?"

"8 25 NegEn+I K+I"
Marta und Lisa besprechen die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit
seiner Kunst AG in einer Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Nicht einmal unsere Kusine war in einem Kunstmuseum - niemand konnte mir über laufende Ausstellungen berichten.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn keine Ausstellung besucht?"

Version 6

"1 2 Neu+I Pre2+D+na"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung hat uns finanzielle Mittel versprochen.", fragt er "Hat das Land nicht auch die Förderung bewilligt?"

"1 10 NegEpi+I N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

"1 18 NegEn+I N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine finanziellen Mittel - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

"1 26 NegEn+I K+i+a"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land finanzielle Mittel bewilligen wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine Gelder - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land auch keine Förderung bewilligt?"

"2 3 Neu+I Pre3+D+na"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht auch bestreiten?"

"2 11 NegEn+I N+D"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht bestreiten?"

"2 19 NegEn+I N+D+an"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel weiß nicht, wer auf das Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb auch nicht bestreiten?"

"2 27 NegEn+I K+i+ea"
Julia und Daniel unterhalten sich über die Reitturniere am Wochenende. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater auf ein Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an keinem Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist nirgends vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater etwa auch keinen Wettbewerb bestreiten?"

"3 4 Neu+I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat mir dieses Werk ans Herz gelegt.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Professor das Buch empfohlen?"

"3 12 NegEn+I N+D+an"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Professor das Buch vorgeschlagen hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch auch nicht empfohlen?"

"3 20 NegEn-I N+D+ean"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch etwa auch nicht empfohlen?"

"3 28 NegEp-I N+I+na"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Seminar. Der eine hat noch von keinem Literaturvorschlag dazu gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor ist der einzige, der ein Buch empfohlen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Professor nicht auch ein Buch empfohlen?"

"4 5 Neu-I Pre2+D+na"

Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat noch nichts davon gehört. Als Ina sagt "Ich freue mich auf die neuen Abenteuer des Kommissar Sulzmann.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch den Krimi lesen?"

"4 13 NegEn+I N+D+ean"

Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Mir gefällt diese Art von Krimi nicht - wer liest so etwas schon?", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund den Krimi etwa auch nicht lesen?"

"4 21 Neu+I Pre2+I+na"

Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund einen Krimi lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Ich werde wohl einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"

"4 29 NegEp-I K+I"

Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat keine Ahnung, was Ina und ihr Freund gerne lesen. Als Ina sagt "Ich werde wohl einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund keinen Krimi lesen?"

"5 6 Neu-I Pre3+D+na"

Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird den Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin das Lied nicht auch singen?"

"5 14 NegEp-I Pre1+D+na"

Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter ist wohl die einzige, die sich traut, den Song vorzutragen.", fragt er "Wird nicht auch die Sekretärin das Lied singen?"

"5 22 Neu-I Pre2+I+na"

Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin nicht auch ein Lied singen?"

"5 30 NegEn-I K+I"

Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird keinen Song vortragen - es wird keine Gesangseinlage geben.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin kein Lied singen?"

"6 7 NegEp+I Pre1+D+na"

Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat gehört, dass der
Inspektor den Gangster befragt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt war der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Inspektor den Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 15 NegEp-I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat noch nichts von diesem Gangster gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch den Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 23 NegEp+I Pre2+I+na"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege hat gehört, dass der Inspektor einen Gangster befragt hat. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der einen Gangster verhört hat.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch einen Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 31 NegEn-I K+I+a"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt - keiner will mit diesen Gangstern reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch keinen Verbrecher vernommen?"

"7 8 NegEp+I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat den Knaben geschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat nicht auch den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"7 16 NegEp+I Pre3+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine weiß nicht, wer den Knaben gemäßregelt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht auch ausgeschimpft?"

"7 24 NegEp+I K+I"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat einen Schüler deshalb richtig ausgeschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor ist der einzige, der Streiche bestraft hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"7 32 NegEn-I K+I+ea"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine weiß nichts über die Strafmaßnahmen. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor hat keinen Schüler zurechtgewiesen - die kommen alle mit ihrem schlechten Benehmen davon.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat etwa auch keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"8 1 Neu+I Pre1+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine hat die Bilderauswahl sehr gemocht.", fragt sie "Hat nicht auch dein Sohn die Ausstellung besucht?"

"8 9 NegEp+I Pre3+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?"

"8 17 NegEp-I N+D"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta weiß nicht, ob Lisas kunstbegeisterter Sohn in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die
Ausstellung nicht besucht?"
"8 25 NegEn+I K+I"
Marta und Lisa besprechen die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in einer Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Nicht einmal unsere Kusine war in einem Kunstmuseum - niemand konnte mir über laufende Ausstellungen berichten.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn keine Ausstellung besucht?"

Version 7

"1 2 Neu+I Pre2+D+na"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung hat uns finanzielle Mittel versprochen.", fragt er "Hat das Land nicht auch die Förderung bewilligt?"
"1 10 NegEp+I N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"
"1 18 NegEn-I N+D+an"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine finanziellen Mittel - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"
"1 26 NegEn+I K+I+a"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land finanzielle Mittel bewilligen wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine Gelder - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land auch keine Förderung bewilligt?"
"2 3 Neu+I Pre3+D+na"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht auch bestreiten?"
"2 11 NegEn+I N+D"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb auch nicht bestreiten?"
"2 19 NegEn-I N+D+an"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel weiß nicht, wer auf das Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb auch nicht bestreiten?"
"2 27 NegEn+I K+I+ea"
Julia und Daniel unterhalten sich über die Reitturniere am Wochenende. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater auf ein Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an keinem Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist nirgends vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater etwa auch keinen Wettbewerb bestreiten?"
"3 4 Neu-I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat mir dieses Werk ans Herz gelegt.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Professor das Buch empfohlen?"

"3 12 NegEn+I N+D+an"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Professor das Buch vorgeschlagen hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch etwa auch nicht empfohlen?"

"3 20 NegEn-I N+D+ean"

Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Seminar. Der eine hat noch von keinem Literaturvorschlag dazu gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor ist der einzige, der ein Buch empfohlen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Professor nicht auch ein Buch empfohlen?"

"4 5 Neu-I Pre2+D+na"

Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat noch nichts davon gehört. Als Ina sagt "Ich freue mich auf die neuen Abenteuer des Kommissar Sulzmann.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch den Krimi lesen?"

"4 13 NegEn+I N+D+ean"

Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Mir gefällt diese Art von Krimi nicht - wer liest so etwas schon?", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund den Krimi etwa auch nicht lesen?"

"4 21 Neu+I Pre2+I+na"

Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund einen Krimi lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Ich werde wohl einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"

"4 29 NegEp-I K+I"

Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat keine Ahnung, was Ina und ihr Freund gerne lesen. Als Ina sagt "Ich bin die einzige bei uns, die einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen will.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund keinen Krimi lesen?"

"5 6 Neu-I Pre3+D+na"

Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird den Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin das Lied nicht auch singen?"

"5 14 NegEp-I Pre1+D+na"

Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter ist wohl die einzige, die sich traute, den Song vorzutragen.", fragt er "Wird nicht auch die Sekretärin das Lied singen?"

"5 22 Neu-I Pre2+I+na"

Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin nicht auch ein Lied singen?"

"5 30 NegEn-I K+I"

Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen
Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird keinen Song vortragen - es wird keine Gesangseinlage geben.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin kein Lied singen?"

"6 7 NegEp+I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Inspektor den Gangster befragt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt war der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch den Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 15 NegEp-I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Inspektor den Gangster befragt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt war der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch den Verbrecher vernommen?"

Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege hat gehört, dass der Inspektor einen Gangster befragt hat. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der einen Gangster verhört hat.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch einen Verbrecher vernommen?"

"6 31 NegEn-I K+I+a"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt - keiner will mit diesen Gangstern reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch einen Verbrecher vernommen?"

"7 8 NegEp+I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat den Knaben geschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat auch den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"7 16 NegEp-I Pre3+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine weiß nicht, wer den Knaben gemaßregelt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht auch ausgeschimpft?"

"7 24 NegEp+I K+I"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat einen Schüler deshalb richtig ausgeschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor ist der einzige, der Streiche bestraft hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

"7 32 NegEn-I K+I+ea"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine weiß nichts über die Strafmaßnahmen. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor hat keinen Schüler zurechtgewiesen - die kommen alle mit ihrem schlechten Benehmen davon.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat etwa auch keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunstausstellung auf der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine hat die Bilderauswahl sehr gemocht.", fragt sie "Hat nicht auch dein Sohn die Ausstellung besucht?"

"8 1 Neu+I Pre1+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunstausstellung auf der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?"
"8 17 NegEp-1 N+D"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta weiß nicht, ob Lisas kunstbegeisterter Sohn in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht besucht?"

"8 25 NegEn+1 K+I"
Marta und Lisa besprechen die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in einer Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Nicht einmal unsere Kusine war in einem Kunstmuseum - niemand konnte mir über laufende Ausstellungen berichten.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn keine Ausstellung besucht?"

Version 8

"1 2 Neu+1 Pre2+D+na"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung hat uns finanzielle Mittel versprochen.", fragt er "Hat das Land nicht auch die Förderung bewilligt?"

"1 10 NegEp+1 N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land die nötigen Gelder geben wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung ist die einzige, die finanzielle Mittel versprochen hat.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

"1 18 NegEn-I N+D"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand weiß nichts von Bewilligungen. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine finanziellen Mittel - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land die Förderung nicht bewilligt?"

"1 26 NegEn+I K+I+a"
Der Professor hatte bei mehreren Stellen Projektförderung beantragt. Der Doktorand hat gehört, dass das Land finanzielle Mittel bewilligen wird. Als der Professor sagt "Die Stiftung gewährt keine Gelder - es sieht schlecht aus für das Projekt.", fragt er "Hat das Land auch keine Förderung bewilligt?"

"2 3 Neu+I Pre3+D+na"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht auch bestreiten?"

"2 11 NegEn+I N+D"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater an dem Turnier teilnehmen wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier teilnehmen.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb nicht bestreiten?"

"2 19 NegEn-I N+D+an"
Julia und Daniel sprechen über ein Reitturnier. Daniel weiß nicht, wer auf das Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an dem Turnier nicht teilnehmen - unser Stall ist dort nicht vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater den Wettbewerb auch nicht bestreiten?"

"2 27 NegEn+I K+I+ea"
Julia und Daniel unterhalten sich über die Reitturniere am Wochenende. Daniel hat gehört, dass Julias Vater auf ein Turnier fahren wird. Als Julia sagt "Die Reitlehrerin wird an keinem
Turnier teilnehmen - unser Stall ist nirgends vertreten.", fragt er "Wird dein Vater etwa auch keinen Wettbewerb bestreiten?"

"3 4 Neu-I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat mir dieses Werk ans Herz gelegt.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Professor das Buch empfohlen?"

"3 12 NegEn+I N+D+an"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Professor das Buch vorgeschlagen hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch etwa auch nicht empfohlen?"

"3 20 NegEp-I N+D+ean"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch etwa auch nicht empfohlen?"

"3 28 NegEp-I N+I+na"
Zwei Studenten unterhalten sich über ein Buch. Der eine weiß nicht, ob das Buch empfohlen ist. Als der andere sagt "Der Tutor hat das Werk nicht erwähnt - also weiß niemand aus dem Seminar davon.", fragt er "Hat der Professor das Buch etwa auch nicht empfohlen?"

"4 5 Neu-I Pre2+D+na"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat noch nichts davon gehört. Als Ina sagt "Ich freue mich auf die neuen Abenteuer des Kommissar Sulzmann.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch den Krimi lesen?"

"4 13 NegEn+I N+D+ean"
Ina und Claudia sprechen über den neuesten Band einer Krimireihe. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund diesen Krimi im Urlaub lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Mir gefällt diese Art von Krimi nicht - wer liest so etwas schon?", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund den Krimi etwa auch nicht lesen?"

"4 21 Neu+I Pre2+I+na"
Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat gehört, dass Inas Freund einen Krimi lesen wird. Als Ina sagt "Ich werde wohl einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund nicht auch einen Krimi lesen?"

"4 29 NegEp-I K+I"
Ina und Claudia besprechen ihre Urlaubslektüre. Claudia hat keine Ahnung, was Ina und ihr Freund gerne lesen. Als Ina sagt "Ich bin die einzige bei uns, die einen Kriminalroman mitnehmen wird.", fragt Claudia "Wird dein Freund keinen Krimi lesen?"

"5 6 Neu-I Pre3+D+na"
Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird den Song vortragen.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin das Lied nicht auch singen?"

"5 14 NegEp-I Pre1+D+na"
Der Chef und sein Assistent besprechen ein altes Volkslied für die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter ist wohl die einzige, die sich traut, den Song vorzutragen.", fragt er "Wird nicht auch die Sekretärin das Lied singen?"

"5 22 Neu-I Pre2+I+na"
Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird einen Song vortragen.",
fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin nicht auch ein Lied singen?"
"5 30 NegEn-I K+I"
Der Chef und der Assistent planen die Jubiläumsfeier. Der Assistent kennt die einzelnen Programmpunkte noch nicht. Als der Chef sagt "Meine Tochter wird keinen Song vortragen - es wird keine Gesangseinlage geben.", fragt er "Wird die Sekretärin kein Lied singen?"
"6 7 NegEp+I Pre1+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Inspektor den Gangster befragt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt war der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat nicht auch der Inspektor den Verbrecher vernommen?"
"6 15 NegEp-I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Polizisten unterhalten sich über einen Verbrecher. Der eine hat noch nichts von diesem Gangster gehört. Als der andere sagt "Der Staatsanwalt ist der einzige, der sich ein Verhör antun wollte.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor nicht auch den Verbrecher vernommen?"
"6 23 NegEp+I Pre2+I+na"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt - keiner will mit diesen Gangstern reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch keinen Verbrecher vernommen?"
"6 31 NegEn-I K+I+a"
Ein Polizist berichtet seinem Kollegen von der Frühschicht. Der Kollege weiß nicht, wer für die Vernehmung zuständig war. Als der Polizist sagt "Der Staatsanwalt hat kein Verhör geführt - keiner will mit diesen Gangstern reden.", fragt er "Hat der Inspektor auch keinen Verbrecher vernommen?"
"7 8 NegEp+I Pre2+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat den Knaben geschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat nicht auch den Schüler ausgeschimpft?"
"7 16 NegEp-I Pre3+D+na"
Zwei Referendare unterhalten sich über die Streiche eines Schülers. Der eine weiß nicht, wer den Knaben gemaßregelt hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor war der einzige, der den Kerl zurechtgewiesen hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat den Schüler nicht auch ausgeschimpft?"
"7 24 NegEp+I K+I"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine hat gehört, dass der Studienrat einen Schüler deshalb richtig ausgeschimpft hat. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor ist der einzige, der Streiche bestraft hat.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"
"7 32 NegEn-I K+I+ea"
Zwei Referendare sprechen über die Schülerstreiche des Halbjahres. Der eine weiß nichts über die Strafmaßnahmen. Als der andere sagt "Der Direktor hat keinen Schüler zurechtgewiesen - die kommen alle mit ihrem schlechten Benehmen davon.", fragt er "Hat der Studienrat etwa auch keinen Schüler ausgeschimpft?"
"8 1 Neu+I Pre1+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine hat die Bilderauswahl sehr gemocht.", fragt sie "Hat nicht auch dein Sohn die Ausstellung besucht?"
"8 9 NegEp+I Pre3+D+na"
Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit
seiner Kunst AG in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht auch besucht?"

"8 17 NegEp-I N+D"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über ein Kunstmuseum. Marta weiß nicht, ob Lisas kunstbegeisterter Sohn in der Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Unsere Kusine ist die einzige aus dem Bekanntenkreis, die die Bilder gesehen hat.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn die Ausstellung nicht besucht?"

"8 25 NegEn+I K+I"

Marta und Lisa sprechen über die Wochenendaktivitäten. Marta hat gehört, dass Lisas Sohn mit seiner Kunst AG in einer Ausstellung war. Als Lisa sagt "Nicht einmal unsere Kusine war in einem Kunstmuseum - niemand konnte mir über laufende Ausstellungen berichten.", fragt sie "Hat dein Sohn keine Ausstellung besucht?"

**Filler**

Der Dirigent und der Bassist unterhalten sich über die neue Aufführung. Der Bassist hält diese für einen vollen Erfolg. Als der Dirigent sagt "Alle sind begeistert von unserer Sopranistin.", fragt er "Mag das Publikum die Altistin auch?"


Der Bergsteiger berichtet seiner Frau von einer neuen Tour. Seine Frau hat Höhenangst. Als er sagt "Lass uns nächstes Wochenende diese Gradwanderung unternehmen!", fragt sie "Kennst Du nicht auch eine schöne Tour durch das Flachland?"

Der Schreiner hat von einer Kundin den Auftrag bekommen, ihr einen Schrank zu fertigen. Die Kundin wünscht sich helles Holz. Als der Schreiner verkündet "Der Schrank wird farblich wunderbar zu ihrem Klavier passen.", fragt sie "Werden Sie denn dunkles Holz verwenden?"

Die Schwimmerin gibt dem Journalisten ein Interview. Der Journalist hat sie neulich mit einem bekannten Mann entdeckt. Als sie sagt "Ich bin im Moment Single.", fragt er "Haben sie einen Freund?"

Der Computerfachmann berät seine Freundin beim Kauf eines PCs. Der Freundin ist das Aussehen ihres neuen Computers besonders wichtig. Als er sagt "Dieses graue Modell hat ein gutes Preis-Leistungs-Verhältnis.", fragt sie "Gibt es denn nichts Schickeres?"

Die Krankenschwester klärt den Kranken über mögliche Komplikationen bei der Operation auf. Der Kranke nimmt sein Leiden nicht sehr ernst. Als die Krankenschwester sagt "Sie werden unter Vollnarkose operiert werden.", fragt er "Muss die Operation denn wirklich sein?"

Die Kosmetikerin berichtet ihrer Kundin über Tricks bei der Hautpflege. Die Kundin ist sehr stolz auf ihre Pfirsichhaut. Als die Kosmetikerin sagt "Bei Ihrem Hauttyp würde ich eine
Spezialcreme empfehlen.", fragt die Kundin "Sollte ich nicht einfach viel Make-Up verwenden?"

5. Literature
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