There are two types of approaches in the literature to analyze responsive predicates, i.e., clause-embedding predicates that are compatible with both declarative and interrogative clauses (e.g., know, be certain). According to the Question-to-Proposition (Q-to-P) reduction approach (Spector & Egré 2015, as well as many other classic papers on this topic), when a predicate $V$ takes a question $Q$ (formally denoting a set of propositions), “$V Q$” is true iff $\exists p \in Q. V (p)$. In recent years, however, Elliott et al. (2017) and Theiler et al. (2018) have argued against this canonical view and in favor of a uniform approach: a responsive predicate always semantically combines with a set of propositions and it takes a singleton set when the complement is declarative, i.e., “$V$ that $p$” is true iff $V (\{p\})$. In this talk, based on data involving predicates of inquisitive emotion, such as “be puzzled” and “be intrigued” and their cross-linguistic counterparts, we argue that neither approach alone is sufficient, and propose a hybrid approach: responsive predicates uniformly combine with sets of propositions, but Q-to-P reduction is still invoked sometimes to obtain otherwise underivable readings. We will furthermore discuss implications of the analysis for an attempt to consider a parallel between distributivity at the clausal domain and at the nominal domain.