

A pragmatic approach to echo questions^{*}

EUN-JU NOH

1 Introduction

Echo questions are in some sense repetitions. They are generally claimed to repeat what has been said, whatever its sentence-type. (See Banfield (1982:124), Quirk et al. (1985: 11.33), Huddleston (1988: 140), McCawley (1988: 720), Radford (1988: 463), Dirven (1989: §883) and Blakemore (1994: 197).)¹ Let us look at some examples:

- (1) A: Columbus discovered America in 1492.
B1: Columbus discovered America in 1492?
B2: Columbus discovered America WHEN?
- (2) A: Have **you** read 'Great Expectations'?
B1: Have **I** read 'Great Expectations'?
B2: Have **I** read WHAT?

^{*}I am very grateful to Deirdre Wilson for her continuous encouragement and many invaluable discussions and comments on the topic of this paper. My thanks are also due to Robyn Carston for her detailed comments on an earlier draft.

¹In contrast, Bolinger (1957: §7) divides repetitive questions into four types; RECLAMATORY questions, in which the speaker calls for a repetition of the preceding utterance or part of it, as in (i B), DITTO questions, in which the speaker repeats his own question, as in (i A2), ECHO questions, in which the speaker repeats the other person's questions, as in (2 B), and REFLEX questions, in which the speaker repeats, as a question, a part or all of the preceding non-question, as in (iii, B).

- (i) A1: When will Jane go to England?
B: What?
A2: When will Jane go to England?
- (ii) A: Did you bring the book?
B: Did I bring the book?
- (iii) A: I met Jane in the park yesterday.
B: Did you meet Jane yesterday?

- (3) A: Go to see the archaeologist.
 B1: Go to see the archaeologist?
 B2: Go to see WHAT/WHO?
- (4) A: God bless the linguist.
 B1: God bless the linguist?
 B2: God bless WHAT/WHO?
- (5) A: What a great pleasure this is!
 B1: What a great pleasure this is?
 B2: What a great WHAT this is?

As shown in (1) - (5), we can repeat any type of sentence, e.g. declarative, interrogative, imperative, etc., to ask something about it. In each example, B1 is repeating A's utterance as a whole, and B2 is repeating A's utterance except for a part, which is replaced by a *wh*-word.

These echo questions can be used not only when the echoer did not hear properly or understand what was said, but also when he wants to express his incredulity at what he heard. For example, in (1), by putting contrastive stress on the verb 'discovered', B1 can question whether use of the verb 'discover' was appropriate, because there were already many Indians in America when Columbus arrived.

The incredulity expressed by echo questions with high-rise intonation can relate to not only the truth-conditional meaning but also non-truth-conditional aspects of the original, e.g. presuppositions, conventional and conversational implicatures, morphology, phonology, style or register, foci, and connotations, which are often ignored in the literature. Echo questions have this property in common with metalinguistic negation.

On the other hand, the term 'question' in 'echo questions' is not syntactically defined. Echo questions do not have the syntactic properties of interrogative sentences, such as inverted word order or *wh*-fronting. It is only because of their high-rise intonation or the presence of *wh*-words that we call them echo questions. While echo questions preserve the sentence-type of the echoed utterance, the personal pronoun is shifted, as can be seen in (2) above.

These properties can be found in echo questions without a prior identical utterance, as in (6):

- (6) A: No, you'd better stop drinking now.
 B: Ah, I am drunk? (suggesting that A thinks 'You are drunk.')

In (6), B is echoing A's alleged thought that B is drunk. Though what is echoed is not an utterance, it is very similar to (2 B) in that the word order is not inverted as in other questions and that the pronoun 'you' is shifted to 'I'.

I shall account for the properties of echo questions in the framework of Relevance Theory. This paper makes two points; in section 2, by discussing the properties of echo questions generally noticed in the literature, I will claim that what is essential in echo questions is 'echoicness' in the sense defined in Relevance Theory. In section 3, I will show that echo questions can be used on the same grounds as metalinguistic negation, i.e. questioning not only truth-conditional meaning, but also the non-truth-conditional aspects mentioned above. Echo questions and metalinguistic negation are both varieties of echoic use expressing different attitudes. In section 4, I will propose that echo questions traditionally defined should be analysed as a variety of free indirect speech, and make some suggestions about their analysis. Section 5 is a summary. Finally, in the Appendix, echo questions in Korean are briefly introduced.

2 Properties of echo questions

2.0 Echo questions have been claimed in the literature to have the following properties:

- (i) They repeat/echo what has been said.
- (ii) They relate to a previous utterance in the discourse context.
- (iii) Morphologically and syntactically, they seem to have more in common with the echoed sentence-types than with standard interrogatives.
- (iv) They are different from other questions in that they are used to question the actual words uttered, rather than the content of previous utterances.
- (v) They are interrogative in the sense defined in Relevance Theory, i.e. they represent desirable thoughts. (See Blakemore (1994))

All these properties² can easily be found in echo questions, but are not always present. I will argue that what is essential to echo questions is that they are **echoic** in the sense defined in Relevance Theory.

2.1 Echo questions as echoic uses

²Echo questions can be distinguished from other questions by their characteristic contrastive stress. This will not be discussed in this paper.

It is traditionally claimed that echo questions are questions which repeat what has been said. This property is treated as essential, and defining. However, the term 'repeat' needs clarification. Consider (7):

- (7) A: He admired Jane's new **car**[ka:r].
 B: He admired Jane's new **car**[ka:]?

In (7), B may echo A's utterance because he wants confirmation of what A said 'he' admired. Echo questions need not involve exact phonetic reduplication. Variations are allowed unless the focus of the question is on that very aspect of the word repeated.

Moreover, they need not repeat word by word, as in (8):

- (8) A: **My mother and father** are coming tonight.
 B: **Your parents** are coming tonight?
 (from Banfield (1982: 125))

As for this reformulation, Banfield (1982: 125) claims that 'the departures permitted require a narrowly defined, language-internal synonymy'.

Banfield's claim is rebutted by Blakemore (1994). Consider (9) - (10), taken from Blakemore (1994: 208 - 209):

- (9) A: **My parents** will be arriving tonight.
 B: **They**'ll be arriving WHEN?
- (10) A: **Mr. Clinton** will be speaking tonight.
 B: **The president** will be speaking WHEN?

Though 'my parents' and 'they', 'Mr. Clinton' and 'the president' are not linguistically synonymous, the echo questions in (9) and (10) are acceptable.

Blakemore claims that the notion of 'echoic use' in the sense defined in Relevance Theory explains these reformulated echo questions. The echoic use of language involves interpreting another representation while expressing a certain attitude to it. Consider (11):

- (11) A: London is a quiet city.
(After a few minutes, an ambulance and a police car pass by with loud sirens.)
B: London is a very quiet city.

In (11), B echoes A's utterance with a dissociative attitude. This is verbal irony. (See Wilson and Sperber (1992)) We can interpret another representation with an endorsing attitude, as in (12):

- (12) A: London is too noisy to live in.
(After a few minutes, an ambulance and a police car pass by with loud sirens.)
B: London is too noisy to live in.

In (12), B is endorsing A's utterance by repeating it. This is also a case of echoic use.

Such 'repetitions' do not have to be verbatim. They involve **representation by resemblance**. (See Wilson and Sperber (1988a) and (1992)). For example, B can echo A's utterance in (11) by saying 'What a quiet city London is!', or in (12), by saying 'London is not a comfortable place to live'. The degree of reformulation must be consistent with the principle of relevance, as noted by Blakemore (1994).³

The claim that echo questions are echoic in this sense has another advantage: it allows echoic questions which involve no prior utterance to be a subtype of echo questions. These will be discussed in the next section.

2.2 The context of echo questions

In connection with the definition of echo questions as repeating what has been said, echo questions are claimed to occur in a restrictive context in which the echoed utterance is contained.

Echo questions are distinguished from other questions by their restricted context. An echo occurs in dialogue as a reaction to a prior utterance and is interpretable only with respect to it, while other questions may be the first or the only utterance in a discourse (Banfield 1982: 124).

³For the Principle of Relevance, see Sperber and Wilson (1986: 155 - 163); for a Relevance-theoretic account of reformulations, see Blakemore (1993).

Echo questions generally require a linguistic context in which the original utterance (be it a declarative, an imperative, or itself a question) has been previously uttered within the discourse (Horn 1989: 381).⁴

I would like to argue against this claim.

In the first place, the representation to be echoed does not have to be an utterance. Consider (13) - (17):

- (13) A French man is looking at a painting titled 'The King of France', where the King is painted bald. He says,
'*The king of France is bald?* We have no king.'
- (14) After proceeding 1 mile in an hour, a driver sees a road sign which reads 'ROADWORKS AHEAD, DELAYS POSSIBLE'. The driver says
'*Delays possible?*'
- (15) Peter, who has heard that more than 5000 people died in the recent Japanese earthquake, is reading an article about the earthquake. He says
'*4000 people died (in the earthquake)?*'
- (16) Hearing a parrot say 'You are a fool' repeatedly, Jack says
'*I am a fool?*'
- (17) Bill, who's got lost in a conference building, sees the same arrow that he followed just before. He says
'Go this way?'

The questions in the examples above are not echo-questions as traditionally defined. What is echoed is a representation existing in the situation, but not an utterance. (A parrot's sound may not be an utterance, because it has no communicative intention.) Besides these written, painted, or indicated representations, unexpressed thoughts can also be echoed, as in (18) (= (6)) and (19):

- (18) A: No, You'd better stop drinking now.
B: Ah, I am drunk? (suggesting that A thinks 'You are drunk.')

⁴Horn (1989: 381) regards echo questions as metalinguistic questions because they need a previous corresponding utterance within the discourse.

- (19) Mozart's wife: I have to take them back after you have seen them. He doesn't know I brought them, and there are no copies (not exactly same as the source).
Salieri: These are originals?
(from the film 'Amadeus')

None of these in (13) - (19) echoes a prior utterance, but they are very similar to echo questions in that their questioning attitudes are indicated by high-rise intonation only.

There is another type of question similar to echo questions, generally called a declarative question, and described as follows: 'When you ask a question using the declarative mood, you expect the answer 'yes', unless you use a negative construction, in which case you expect the answer 'no' (Collins Cobuild 1990: 205). Consider (20) - (22):

- (20) A: Yesterday I met the doctor I told you about.
B: So, he gave you the treatment?
- (21) A: I was finally able to get the money.
B: Then, you left for America?
- (22) A: The prince proposed to Cinderella.
B: And her step-sisters couldn't maltreat her any more?

All these questions are declarative with final rising intonation. Traditionally, these would not be defined as echo questions, since they do not repeat the previous utterance. Intuitively, they present an inference drawn from that utterance, with a request for confirmation, like a telescoped tag question of 'He gave you the treatment, didn't he?'. One suggestion is that they are similar to (18) and (19), in that they request confirmation of what the speaker takes to be an implicature of the preceding utterance.

In Relevance Theory, the sorts of things that can be interpreted include not only utterances, but also thoughts: e.g. unspoken thoughts, expectations, hopes, etc. So, echoic use, which is a variety of interpretive use, can echo these kinds of representation. The notion of 'echo' defined in Relevance Theory seems preferable to the more traditional one, because it allows us to treat the questions in (13) - (22), which do not echo a prior utterance, as a subtype of echo questions.

D. Wilson has suggested that confirmation of this approach could be provided by the following examples, in which there is no prior utterance at all:

- (23) A sees B walking towards the door, and says,
 a. 'You're off to catch the train?'
 b. '?Henry VII had seven wives?'
 c. 'Did Henry VII have seven wives?'

On the analysis I propose, (a) is acceptable because A attributes to B a thought that B could plausibly have; (b) is unacceptable because the thought attributed is one B could not plausibly have in the circumstances; (c) is acceptable because it involves no attributed thought. So we can see the same property of attribution in (a) as an echo question which echoes a prior utterance.

2.3 Sentence-types and echo questions

It is generally claimed that echo questions are of the same sentence-types as the echoed utterances.

We will analyze the echoes as belonging to the same clause type as the corresponding examples [the original sentences], differing from them by means of a property distinct from clause-type; the echo property is of course, another factor that overrides the clause type in the determination of illocutionary force' [the square brackets are mine] (Huddleston 1984: 377).

Morphologically and syntactically, echo questions seem to have more in common with the sentence-types they are used to echo than with the corresponding nonecho questions (Radford 1988: 464).

Though an echo question appears to have the same sentence-type as the echoed utterance, its internal structure is very different from that of the echoed utterance. For example, in an imperative sentence, the understood subject is the second person 'you', but in an imperative echo question, it is the first person 'I'. Consider (24) - (25):

- (24) A: Know yourself.
 B: Know myself?
- (25) A: Keep your secrets to yourself.
 B: Keep my secrets to myself?

In (24 B), the person who is supposed to 'know myself' is B, not A, as can be seen from the reflexive pronoun 'myself'. These cases are very different from normal imperatives, where the understood subject is always 'you'. The same holds for (25 B).

Echoes of interrogative sentences show the same kind of differences. Consider (26):

- (26) A: Where are you going?
B: Where am I going?

In (26, B), the speaker B does not need information about where he is going, which is what A is seeking. So B does not express the attitude that the speaker of a standard question is supposed to have.

Even in declaratives, there is a difference. Consider (27) - (28):

- (27) A: The rabbi must have known the fact.
B1: The rabbi must have known the fact?
B2: WHO must have known the fact?

- (28) A: Tom shall inherit my property.
B1: Tom shall inherit your property?
B2: WHO shall inherit your property?

In (27), the echo question in B1 has an epistemic modal verb, but responsibility for its use is referred to speaker A rather than speaker B. For the same reason, B2's question is acceptable, although as a non-echo question, it is not acceptable.⁵ In (28 B1, B2), Tom's inheriting A's property is not of B's volition, but A's.

On the other hand, Cooper (1983: 148 - 150) points out that echo questions and quiz show questions, as in (29 a), should be the same as the corresponding sentence where the speaker stops and waits for the hearer to complete the sentence as in (29 b):

- (29) a. The king who reigned over France in 1780 is WHO?
b. The king who reigned over France in 1780 is ... ?

⁵See Progovac (1993: 160). He uses the following examples, to show that Op (the empty polarity operator) is incompatible with epistemic modals, in the same way wh-words are.

- (i) a. ?*Who must have left?
b. ?*Must John have left?
c. ?*If John must have left, we must go too.

Furthermore, he claims that these questions cannot be generated by grammatical rules, because they are totally random. Consider his examples (Cooper 1983: 149-150 (v) - (viii)):

- (30) A: This animal is totally quercivorous.
B: This animal is totally WHAT?

- (31) a. *What is this animal totally?
b. *Totally what is this animal?

- (32) A: He voiced a querimony.
B: He voiced a WHAT?
c. *What did he voice a?
d. *A what did he voice?

- (33) a. This animal is totally whativerous?
b. He voiced a whatimony?

The echo questions in (30 B) and (32 B) are very different from normal questions, in that the *wh*-word *what* replaces an adjective as well as a noun, and it cannot occur at the front of the sentence as shown in (31) and (32). In other words, whereas *what* has a definite syntactic category in normal questions, there is no constraint on what it can replace in an echo question, so that it can even replace parts of words as in (33). Because of this irregularity, he claims, there is no general theory of the grammar of questions to generate echo questions and normal questions.⁶

To conclude, echo questions may have the same word order as the echoed utterance, but their syntactic details are very different from those of the original sentences.

⁶Compare Sobin (1990), where he proposes an analysis of English echo questions which brings them into the realm of normal question syntax, arguing for 'a discourse strategy called Comp-freezing' and 'unselective binding of in-situ *wh*-phrases'. But he deals only with echo questions where *what* is replacing a noun phrase, in which case, the *what* can occur at the front of the sentence. In the end, Cooper and Sobin appear to have opposite ideas, but in fact they don't. They are dealing with different examples, or rather, Sobin's examples are a subset of Cooper's.

2.4 What is questioned in echo questions?

Banfield (1982: 125) claims that the difference between echo questions and other questions lies in what can be questioned. She says;

The echo question is used to question what might be more appropriately termed the style of an utterance, the actual words uttered, and not what they referred to (Banfield 1982: 125).

Consider (34):

- (34) A: She married the doctor.
B: She married WHAT?

According to Banfield, the echo question in (34) cannot be used to question who the doctor is. Blakemore (1994) claims that a different echo question can be used to question who the doctor is. This could be done if B2 said 'She married WHO?'.

Furthermore, we can use echo questions when we do not know what a word means. For example, in (35), providing B1 and B2 are not Korean people, and do not know what 'Kimchi' means/is, they can use the echo questions to question what the word means, not the actual word uttered:

- (35) A: I will learn to make Kimchi from a Korean friend. (Kimchi: Korean pickle)
B1: You will learn to make Kimchi?
(mimicking the pronunciation of 'Kimchi')
B2: You will learn to make WHAT?

So the claim that echo questions are used only to question the actual words uttered is too strong to allow this kind of echo question.

In addition, echo questions are often used to express the echoer's attitude to the meaning of an utterance, including its presuppositions and implicatures, as will be shown in section 3. There, the echoer is clearly using an echo question to question the content rather than the form. In other words, he may be asking 'Do you think ~?' rather than 'Did you say ~?' These echo questions are also counterexamples to Banfield's claim.

2.5 Echo questions are interrogatives?

Blakemore (1994) claims that echo questions are interrogatives, on the basis of Wilson & Sperber's (1988 a) claim that interrogative utterances achieve relevance by representing their answer as desirable, or relevant. She says:

... it is possible to see all the different concerns ... as particular instances of a more general concern, namely, whether B's utterance (the echo question) is a faithful enough representation of A's utterance, or, in the case of *wh*-echo, what would make B's utterance an adequately faithful representation of A's utterance (Blakemore 1994: 205).

In *Yes-no* questions, the echoer can be understood as communicating that the proposition that his utterance is an adequately faithful representation of someone else's utterance is an interpretation of a relevant thought. That is, the answer to the echo question should indicate whether the utterance is an adequately faithful representation of the utterance it echoes. Let us look at some examples:

- (36) A: Jane married a millionaire.
 B1: Jane married a millionaire?
 B2: Jane married a miller?

According to Blakemore, B1 is communicating that the proposition that his utterance is an adequately faithful representation of A's utterance is an interpretation of a relevant thought. So the answer that A should provide will be 'Yes'. For the same reason, the answer to B2's question should be 'No'.

In *wh*-echo questions, the echoer can be understood as communicating the proposition that what would make the echoer's utterance an adequately faithful representation of the echoed utterance is an interpretation of a relevant thought. So the answer should concern the value of the *wh*-words. Consider (37):

- (37) A: Jane married a billionaire.
 B: Jane married a WHAT?

According to Blakemore, B is communicating the proposition that what would make B's utterance an adequately faithful representation of A's utterance, i.e. the value for 'what', is the relevant thought of the question. The answer will be 'billionaire'.

It is not clear that an echoer always wants to identify what the prior speaker has said. In other words, it is not always clear that an echo questioner communicates 'the

proposition that his utterance is being used as a representation of the echoed utterance' and that '*this* proposition is being used as an interpretation of a desirable thought'. (Blakemore (1994: 205)) Consider (38):

- (38) a. A: I've bought you an aeroplane.
 B: You've bought me an AEROPLANE?
 b. A: I've bought you an aeroplane.
 B: you've bought me a WHAT?
 (from Blakemore (1994: (1 a, b)))

The echo question in (38), as she argues, can be used to 'communicate an attitude of incredulity towards the proposition that A expressed the proposition that he has bought B an aeroplane.' (Blakemore 1994: 205) In this case, is it really true that what B means is to ask whether this echo is an adequately faithful representation of A's utterance? Blakemore might claim that he is asking for verification of what he has heard in order to express his incredulity indirectly. However, the examples in (39), (40) (= (13)) and (41) (= (14)) are hard to account for on her approach.

- (39) A: I met the epidemiologist.
 B: You met WHO?
 A: The man who gave the lecture.
 (from Blakemore 1994: (21))

- (40) A French man is looking at a painting titled 'The King of France', where the King is painted bald. He says,
 '*The king of France is bald?* We have no king.'

- (41) After proceeding 1 mile in an hour, a driver sees a road sign which reads 'ROADWORKS AHEAD, DELAYS POSSIBLE'. The driver says
 '*Delays possible?*'

In (39), given that B heard A's utterance clearly, knows what the word 'epidemiologist' means and only wants to identify who 'the epidemiologist' refers to, as she argues, can we say that B is communicating the proposition that what would make his utterance an adequately faithful representation of A's utterance is an interpretation of a desirable thought? Moreover in (40), where there is no prior utterance to be echoed, is the French man seeking to know whether this is an adequately faithful representation of the echoed thought? In the same way, in (41), if the driver's companion says 'yes',

it might mean not 'yes, that's what it says', but 'yes, I agree with you that it's a ridiculous sign.'

Even granted that Blakemore's approach can account for these cases, it still has some problems with (42) -(43), from Blakemore (1994: (22) and (23)).

(42) A: Echo questions aren't interrogatives.

B: Echo questions aren't interrogatives?

A: Not from a syntactic point of view.

(43) A: I was blown over by the wind.

B: You were blown over by the WIND?

A: Well, it was blowing at about 80 miles per hour.

If B's concern is really with whether his utterance is an adequately faithful representation of A's utterance, there is no reason for A to give detailed answers as in (42) and (43), because B's utterance could not be a more faithful representation of A's utterance.

Let us think more generally about whether echo questions are interrogatives. The term 'interrogative' is generally used to indicate a type of sentence.⁷ But when Blakemore claims that echo questions are interrogatives, she seems to mean it pragmatically, i.e. she uses the term rather loosely. Thus she says:

I shall argue that the fact that from a syntactic point of view echo questions resemble the sentences they echo does not necessarily mean that they cannot be interpreted as communicating a questioning attitude (Blakemore 1994: 200).

From this, we might conclude that what she means by 'interrogative' is a pragmatic notion (e.g. illocutionary force).

By contrast, as far as I can understand, what Wilson and Sperber (1988 a) mean by 'interrogative' is a syntactic category. The common property of rhetorical questions, exam questions, guess-questions, surprise-questions, expository questions, self-addressed questions, and speculative questions, all of which are used as interrogative sentences, is the syntactic one of inverted main-clause word-order, etc. not a

⁷Consider Leech's categorisation (Leech 1983: 114), which means that 'the sense of a declarative, of an interrogative sentence, and of an imperative is respectively a proposition, a question, and a mand. The link between the semantic and pragmatic categories, however, is less clear-cut', e.g. a proposition or a question can have the force of an imperative (ibid.: 115).

pragmatic one. So Blakemore's approach based on Wilson and Sperber (1988)'s analysis of interrogatives could be seen as an overgeneralisation.

In addition, polarity items are not affected by the questioning attitude expressed by echo questions. Consider (44) - (45):

(44) A: Don't worry! I have some money.

B: You have some money?

? You have any money?

(45) A: He knows both of the languages.

B: He knows both of them?

? He knows either of them?

In (44) and (45), echo questions do not trigger negative polarity items, which are usually used in non-assertive forms like negatives and interrogatives. This is indirect evidence against the claim that echo questions are interrogative syntactically and semantically.

Rather than looking for a relation between echo questions and non-echo questions, and treating both as interrogatives interpreting a desirable thought, as Blakemore does, I would like to concentrate on the relation between echo questions and other echoes, where a certain attitude is expressed to what is echoed. Consider (46):

(46) A: I went to London.

B1: You went to London?

B2: You went to London!

B1 is an echo question with high-rise intonation, and B2 is an echo exclamation with high-fall intonation. They are two varieties of echoic use of language, expressing different attitudes to what is echoed.

Both types of echoes have the intonation nucleus and focus on old information. Cruttenden (1986) claims that old information gets nuclear stress and focus when it is contrastive, echoed, or insisted on. He claims:

...echo questions and echo exclamations : In both cases it is obvious that the nucleus is not falling on new information but on old information which has special importance for the speaker (Cruttenden 1986: 92).

In fact, echoes are expressive, and there may be no new information other than the speaker's attitude.

To conclude, the claim that echo questions are interrogatives encounters a complication. Echo questions are apparently not interrogative syntactically, and if they are interrogative (as a loose term) pragmatically, it is not clear that Wilson & Sperber's account of syntactic interrogatives can apply to these pragmatic interrogatives. I think echo questions, as a variety of echoic use, are used to express the echoer's questioning attitude to a prior utterance or more generally, an existing contextual assumption. The grounds on which the attitude is expressed can include non-truth-conditional aspects of the echoed utterance as well as its truth-conditional meaning. This is very similar to metalinguistic negation, which is discussed in the next section.

3 Various uses of echo questions

An echo question can be used to question what the echoer did not hear properly. Consider (47):

- (47) A: The train starts at ten to two.
 B1: The train starts at ten to TWO?
 B2: The train starts WHEN?

The two echo questions in (47) may be used because B1 and B2 did not hear A's utterance properly. In (B1), the contrastive stress, and in (B2), the *wh*-word 'WHEN' together with the contrastive stress on it, indicate what is questioned.

An echo question can also be used when the echoer wants to express his incredulity at the truth-conditional meaning of the utterance. The fact that the contents of echo questions are attributed to the hearer enables us to explain why there is no contradiction in (48 B):

- (48) A: She was bad-looking.
 B: She was bad-looking? I saw how beautiful she was.⁸

⁸Bolinger (1978) claims that the distinction between yes-no questions and alternative questions lies in the fact that the former are indefinite, and the latter are definite. However, we can see another difference in the following example.

- (i) a. She was bad-looking? I saw how beautiful she was.
 b. ?Was she bad looking? I saw how beautiful she was.
 c. !Was she bad-looking or not? I saw how beautiful she was.

In (i), (b) is acceptable when there is a prior utterance 'She was bad-looking', but (c) cannot be used in that context, nor as an initial utterance. See 4.2.

B is expressing his incredulity at what was said, in Grice's sense, i.e. the truth-conditional content that 'she' was bad-looking.

The echoer can use echo questions to focus on aspects of non-truth-conditional meaning like presuppositions, conventional or conversational implicatures. Consider (49) - (50):

- (49) A: The king of France is bald.
B: The king of France is bald? There is no king of France.
- (50) A: Bill stopped smoking.
B: Bill stopped smoking? He has never smoked.

In (49), B echoes A's utterance with a questioning attitude, because its *presupposition* that there is a king of France is not fulfilled. In (50), the verb 'stop' *presupposes* that Bill smoked before; so B might wonder about the *presupposition*.

Conventional implicatures can also be focused on by echo questions:

- (51) A: You finally managed to solve the problems.
B: Managed? I solved them in two minutes.
- (52) A: He is rich, but he is friendly.
B: But? Not every rich man is unfriendly.

In (51), the verb 'manage' *conventionally implicates* that solving 'the problems' was difficult, and in (52), the conjunct 'but' *conventionally implicates* that the two clauses flanking it are contrastive, or the second is unexpected given the first. In each example, the ground on which the echoer echoes A's utterance with a questioning attitude (indicated by high-rise intonation) lies in the *conventional implicature*.

Generalised conversational implicatures and *particularised conversational implicatures* in (53) - (54) further illustrate this aspect of echo questions:

- (53) A: I saw you kissing a woman on Oxford Street yesterday.
B: You saw me kissing a woman? That was my wife. We went out last night.

- (54) A: What was he doing?
 B: He was stirring all ingredients in the saucepan.
 C: I was stirring all ingredients in the saucepan? I was cooking a Chinese stir fry.

The generalised conversational implicature of 'a woman' in (53) is that 'she' is not his wife and the particularised conversational implicature in (54) is that his cooking lacked skill. These implicatures are singled out by the echo questions. In both cases, it is possible to echo only the words concerned, deleting the other irrelevant parts. For example, in (53), B can repeat only 'a woman' without losing any of the effect of an echo question.

Morphology, pronunciation, and word stress can also be the grounds for echo questions, as in (55) - (57):

- (55) A: We trapped two mongeese.
 B: You trapped two mongeese? You mean 'mongooses'.
 (56) A: I love [luv] my wife. (love [luv]: pronunciation of Northern England)
 B: You love [luv] your wife? I love[l/v] my wife.
 (57) A: Did you call the POLice?
 B: POLice? I called the poLICE.

So Banfield (1982:125) says, 'Echo questions may very well comment on an oddity of the echoed speaker's pronunciation or a discrepancy between the echoed speaker's and the echoer's dialect.'

Finally, echo questions can be used to question the pragmatic implication associated with the register or style of the echoed utterance, as in (58), its focus, as in (59), or its connotations as in (60):

- (58) A: His father kicked the bucket.
 B: Kicked the bucket? Is he your friend?
 (59) A: We have a half-empty bottle of wine.
 B: Half-empty? It's half-full.
 (60) A: She is a black police woman.
 B: A black police woman? She is a policewoman who is black.

Such echo questions tend to echo only the words or phrases concerned, as in (58) - (60), though a fuller echo is possible.

These grounds for echo questions are very similar to those for metalinguistic negation. Metalinguistic negation is used as 'a device for objecting to a previous utterance on any grounds whatever, including the conventional or conversational implicatures it potentially induces, its morphology, its style or register, or its phonetic realization.' (Horn 1989: 363) Let us have a look at some examples corresponding to the echo questions above:

- (61) A: The king of France is bald.
B: The king of France is not bald. There is no king of France.
- (62) A: What was he doing?
B: He was stirring all ingredients in the saucepan.
C: I was not stirring all ingredients in the saucepan. I was cooking a Chinese stir fry.
- (63) A: Are you meeting a man tonight?
B: I'm not meeting a man; I'm meeting my husband.
- (64) A: We have a half-empty bottle of wine.
B: It is not half-empty. It's half-full.
- (65) A: Did you call the POLice?
B: I didn't call the POLice. I called the poLICE.

In (61), the focus of the negation is the presupposition that there is a King of France. In (62) - (65), the conversational implicature arising from the maxim of MANNER, the conversational implicature arising from the maxim of QUANTITY, the focus, and the word stress of 'POLice' are the targets of the metalinguistic negation, respectively. This similarity may be due to echoic use in the sense defined in Relevance Theory.⁹

Both types of utterance are echoing a prior utterance, or at least a representation existing in the context, in order for the echoer to express his attitude to the representation echoed.¹⁰

⁹For detailed discussion of the echoic nature of metalinguistic negation, see Carston (1994).

¹⁰Echo questions and metalinguistic negation have contrastive stress on the focus itself. This common property is also due to the fact that they are varieties of echoic use.

Can this approach deal with echo questions which are used to verify or identify what the echoer has not heard properly? Consider (66), repeated from (47):

- (66) A: The train starts at ten to two.
 B1: The train starts at ten to TWO?
 B2: The train starts WHEN?

In (66), B may be echoing A's utterance because he wants confirmation of what he has heard, or identification of what he has not heard properly. I think that these echo questions can also be said to be varieties of echoic use, for it is possible to echo a representation which we do not know exactly and completely. So, we can say B is echoing A's utterance because he is wondering about what he has not heard properly. The questioning attitude in this case is sincere, while in (48) - (60), the speaker may be pretending to question some aspect of the echoed utterance.

To sum up, echo questions may be used to focus on an aspect of the proposition expressed, implicatures, morphology, phonology, style or register, foci, and connotations, and the echoer expresses his attitude to (an aspect, or part of) a prior utterance, or at least a representation in context. The reason the echoer questions these may be that he did not hear them properly, or he wants to express his incredulity or objection to them implicitly by showing his incredulity.

4 Echo questions as reported speech

4.1 Echo questions as free indirect speech

Though echo questions are questions which repeat what has been said by other speakers, the repetition/echo is very different from other cases of repetition. Consider (67) - (68):

- (67) A: **Did you** meet the president at the reception?
 B: **Did I** meet the president?
- (68) A: **Don't** love **my** sister.
 B: **Don't** love **your** sister?

As seen in (67) and (68), echo questions do not change the original sentence-types, so Huddleston (1984: 377), Radford (1988: 464) and others claim that echo questions belong to the same sentence-types as the original. (See also 3.2.)

However they did not pay attention to the fact that echo questions have personal pronouns shifted, so that the first pronoun 'I' refers to the echoer. This is very similar to free indirect speech (or FID), which resembles indirect speech in person and tense, and direct speech in sentence-type (word order) and in not being embedded under a higher verb of saying/thinking.¹¹ Compare an echo question with FID, in (69).

- (69) Peter to Mary: Have you ever been to Paris?
- a. Reported speech by someone else¹²
 - DS: Peter said to Mary, 'Have you ever been to Paris?'
 - ID: Peter asked Mary if she had ever been to Paris.
 - FID: Peter asked Mary, had she ever been to Paris?
 - b. Reported speech by Mary
 - DS: Peter said to me, 'Have you ever been to Paris?'
 - ID: Peter asked me if I had ever been to Paris.
 - FID: Peter asked me, **had I ever been to Paris?**
 - c. Echo question
 - Mary: **Have I ever been to Paris?**

DS: direct speech ID: indirect speech FID: free indirect speech

As shown in (69), free indirect speech is similar to direct speech in syntax, and to indirect speech in person and tense. The echo question in (c) is the same as the FID in (b), except for the tense which is not back-shifted. But I think the difference in tense cannot prevent us from regarding echo questions as a variety of FID. As echo questions occur so immediately after the original utterance, we do not have to shift the tense backward, i.e. the echoed and the echoing belong to the same tense.

According to Wilson & Sperber (1988 a), FID can be used either to report information, or to express the echoer's attitude to the information. In the latter case, the utterance is echoic. Echo questions are an example. A report of information would be useless because the hearer already knows the information, which has been provided by himself.

¹¹McHale (1978: 252) also mentions deictic elements, and the admissibility of various direct discourse features with respect to FID. I will not deal with them in this paper.

¹²See Banfield (1982), where she discusses the properties of FID in detail. But her notion of FID, which is termed 'represented speech and thought', does not cover the whole range of FID.

4.2 Further suggestions

We have seen that echo questions are a variety of FID, and that they are used to express the echoer's attitude to what he is echoing. What exactly is the attitude? D. Wilson has suggested that the attitude in echo questions is one of 'wondering about', where a whole lot of different aspects of the echoed utterance can be wondered about, while the attitude expressed in ordinary questions is 'wondering whether, wondering what, etc.'

On this basis, we can distinguish between the attitudes expressed by echo questions and by ordinary questions also used after a corresponding utterance. Consider (70):

- (70) A: Columbus discovered America in 1492.
 B1: Columbus discovered America WHEN?
 B2: When did Columbus discover America?

B2's question is not generally regarded as an echo question, despite the fact that it seems to be partially echoing the proposition expressed by A's utterance.¹³ While B1 is wondering about A's utterance, B2 is wondering when Columbus discovered America. That is, B2 is interested in the fact (or the state-of-affairs) itself, not A's utterance about the fact. As A has just given this information, asking for it sincerely again would be improbable in normal situations. So it is likely that the questioning attitude in (B2) is pretended for some additional contextual effect. Consider (71):

¹³Quirk et al. (1985: 11.34 - 37) treat this kind of question as an echo question, and Sobin (1990: 141) calls it a 'pseudo-echo question'. In contrast, Huddleston (1994: section 10.) argues that it is an open interrogative, not an echo question, because in echo questions, fronting is not always possible, as in (i), and fronting is excluded when the stimulus is interrogative, as in (ii).

- (i) A: I've just arrived at the beautiful beach. (by telephone)
 B: a. You've just arrived at the beautiful WHAT?
 b. *At the beautiful what have you just arrived?
- (ii) A: Was she there in the morning?
 B: a. Was she there WHEN?
 b. *When was she there?

The first argument is on the same lines as Cooper (1983), which is discussed in section 2.5. As for the second, even in the case of imperative sentences, their echo questions do not allow fronting as in (iii).

- (iii) A: Go to the temple.
 B: a. Go to WHERE?
 b. Where go to?

Sobin (1990) also notices that his 'pseudo-echo questions' are only possible in 'questionable statements'.

- (71) Peter: The president's resigned.
Mary: Has he?

Example (71) is taken from Wilson & Sperber (1988: 18), where it is used as an example of a 'surprise-question', which 'expresses Mary's surprise or incredulity at the information she has been given'. Though Mary seems to echo the proposition expressed by Peter's utterance, her concern is not with Peter's utterance or thought, but with the fact or the information that the president has resigned. Here, Mary's utterance can be seen as a request for confirmation of information which (she implies) she can scarcely believe.

On the other hand, compared to alternative questions or *wh*-questions, which Bolinger (1978) treats as definite, *yes-no* questions can contain an interpretive element, an allusion to a prior utterance or thought. Consider (72):

- (72) A: It's cold outside.
B1: It's cold? It's freezing.
B2: ?Is it cold? It's freezing.
B3: *Is it cold or not? It's freezing.

If there is not a prior utterance like A's, B2 and B3's utterances are not acceptable, because in each case, the two clauses are inconsistent. When B2's question echoes a prior utterance, as in (72), it sounds better, but B3's does not. The echoic uses in B1' and B2's are not the same, however. As mentioned before, in the former, the attitude is one of 'wondering about A's utterance', while in the second, the attitude is 'wondering if it is cold, because A says it is cold.'

We can see the difference more clearly in the following example:

- (73) A: You started drinking again.
B1: I started drinking again? I have never stopped drinking.
(from the film 'Darkness before Dawn')
B2: ?Did I start drinking again? I have never stopped drinking.
B3: *Did I start drinking again or not? I have never stopped drinking.

In (73), B1 echoes A's utterance because he wants to express his attitude to it, e.g. objecting to it indirectly by questioning it. As the proposition that B1 started drinking again is attributed to A, the following utterance 'I have never stopped drinking' does not contradict the previous one. In contrast, B2 is asking about the state-of-affairs or the information, out of the blue. This sounds odd, because B2 should know the answer better than anyone else. But when it echoes A's utterance, it sounds better, for

the proposition is attributed to A. On the other hand, in B3, the two sentences are a kind of contradiction. In the first sentence, he is asking whether he started drinking again (actually the question itself is not natural), while in the second, he says that he has never stopped drinking, which implies it is impossible for him to start drinking again. We need more study to distinguish between *yes-no* questions and *wh*-questions including alternative questions, with respect to 'echoic' nature.

On the other hand, Banfield (1982: 126) claims that while 'Yes-no and *wh*-questions may be embedded as 'indirect questions', such as *I wonder whether Joe saw Bill* or *I asked who Joe saw*, echo questions may not be embedded (as indirect questions)'. [parentheses mine] Consider her examples in (74), from Banfield (1982: 53).

- (74) a. 'Has who our leave to sit down?' said Mr. Magershon.
(Beckett, *Watt*, p.185)
b. Mr Magershon said who has our leave to sit down?
c. Mr Magershon asked who had our leave to sit down.

According to her, while Mr. Magershon asked an echo question in (74 a), he did not ask a question, but made a statement that somebody should sit down in (74 b), where the whole sentence is an echo question. It follows that an echo question is not embeddable. In order to report indirectly an echo question, an indirect question must be used as in (74 c). But in this case, the original distinction between a normal question and an echo question is lost.

This accords with the observation that the echoer's attitude is to the original speaker's utterance, not the state-of-affairs itself, as seen above. Consider (75), repeated from (70):

- (75) A: Columbus discovered America in 1492.
B1: Columbus discovered America WHEN?
B2: When did Columbus discover America?

B2's question, which is likely to be used without a prior occurrence of an utterance such as A's, can be embedded as an indirect question like 'B2 asked when Columbus discovered America.' In contrast, B1 is questioning/wondering about the time at which A said Columbus discovered America. If we want to report B1's question as indirect speech, we have to say, 'B1 wondered about the time that **A said** Columbus discovered America.'

D. Wilson points out (personal communication) that an echo question can be embedded under a parenthetical verb of saying, as in (76).

- (76) a. You ask did I read 'Great Expectations'?
 b. Did I read 'Great Expectations', you ask?

Moreover McHale (1978) argues that in literary indirect speech (or indirect discourse, in his terms), the expressive elements such as word order or exclamatory form of reported speech can be preserved, as in (77), from McHale (1978: 254):

- (77) a. Mr. Smith asked Eleanor wouldn't she eat lunch with them as she was mentioned in the will [...]. (*42nd Parallel*, 230)
 b. When they came out Charley said by heck he thought he wanted to go [...] (*42nd Parallel*, 385)
 c. But Eveline said what could be more exciting than to be in Paris [...]. (*1919*, 303)

We need to study echo questions as cases of indirect speech.

Finally, let us look at questions quoting the actual words of previous utterance. Consider (78) - (80):

- (78) A: I loved you.
 B: 'I loved you'? Didn't you love my money?
- (79) A: Don't love my sister.
 B: 'Don't love my sister'? Is she your child?
- (80) A: Did you know the number?
 B: 'Did you know the number'? I was the very man who fixed it.

In these examples, not only the sentence-type of the original utterance, but also the personal pronouns are not changed in the repetition. This is identical with direct speech.

Furthermore, contra Banfield (1982: 126), who claims that echo questions do not reproduce direct address, I think address and even exclamatory utterances can be echoed as long as the echoer's attitude is to the address, or the exclamatory marker, especially when it is quoted alone without an additional utterance. Consider (81) - (83):

- (81) A: Let us go, little boy.
 B1: 'Let us go, little boy'? I am your master.
 B2: 'Let us go, WHAT/WHO'? I am your master.

- (82) A: I object to the interrogation, Mr.Smith.
 B: 'Mr.Smith'? I told you to call me John.
- (83) A: Oh, my God! You were the murderer.
 B: 'Oh, my God'? I thought you'd known it since you had found the pistol in my drawer.

In (81), B is echoing A's utterance, in order to object to the direct address 'little boy', which conversationally implicates that he is not A's master. In the same way, in (82), B is expressing his attitude to the address 'Mr.Smith', and in (83), to the exclamation 'Oh, my God!'. As these attitudes are basically 'questioning, or wondering about', be it sincere or pretended, we can extend our analysis to include this case, by generalising the notion of echoic use to include attitudes both to form and to content.

I propose that these questions should also be treated as a variety of echo questions, or at least, echoic questions, because they also echo a prior utterance/an existing assumption in the context and express the echoer's attitude to them, though in a different way from echo questions traditionally defined. If I am right, this leads to a possible conclusion that echo questions can take the form of direct, indirect, or free indirect speech. Echo questions traditionally defined are cases of free indirect speech echo questions.

5 Summary

We have considered the properties of echo questions as discussed in the literature, and argued that what is essential to echo questions is that they are 'echoic' in the sense defined in Relevance Theory. The notion of 'echoicness' allows us to generalise echo questions as traditionally defined and other echoic questions without a prior utterance. All are cases of echoic use.

Echo questions are used not only to question what the echoer has failed to hear, but also to express his attitude to what he has heard. The attitude is one of 'wondering about'. Whether the attitude is sincere or pretended does not matter. The grounds for using echo questions are very similar to those of metalinguistic negation: both are cases of echoic use in the sense defined in Relevance Theory.

Echo questions are a variety of free indirect speech, because they resemble direct speech in word-order, and indirect speech in person. Though echo questions are FID, this reported speech is not used to give information, but to express the echoer's attitude to the echoed. This distinguishes echo questions from other FIDs, and is again covered by the relevant-theoretic notion of echoic use.

We have also compared echo questions with ordinary questions. They are distinguished by their different attitudes. The attitude in echo questions is 'wondering about a prior utterance or thought', while the attitude in ordinary questions is 'wondering whether, wondering what, etc.' about the state-of-affairs itself.

Finally I suggested that the definition of echo questions should be extended to accommodate cases of indirect speech and direct speech as echo questions.

Appendix: echo questions in Korean

In Korean, sentences can be classified into four major types which are formally distinguished by sets of inflectional suffixes. Let us observe in (1) how the verb stem *po* 'see' inflects in each type. (The Yale Romanization system is used in transcribing Korean examples.)

(1) From Sohn (1994: 8)

sentence-type	declarative (DC)	interrogative (Q)	imperative (IM)	propositive (PR)
speech-level				
plain	<i>po-n-ta</i> IN-DC	<i>po-ni</i> Q	<i>po-a-la</i> INF-IM	<i>po-ca</i> PR
intimate	<i>po-a</i> INF	<i>po-a</i> INF	<i>po-a</i> INF	<i>po-a</i> INF
familiar	<i>po-ney</i> DC	<i>po-na</i> Q	<i>po-key</i> IM	<i>po-sey</i> PR
blunt	<i>po-o</i> BLN	<i>po-o</i> BLN	<i>po-o</i> BLN	
polite	<i>po-a-yo</i> INF-POL	<i>po-a-yo</i> INF-POL	<i>po-a-yo</i> INF-POL	<i>po-a-yo</i> INF-POL
deferential	<i>po-p-ni-ta</i> AH-IN-DC	<i>po-si-p-ni-kka</i> SH-AH-IN-Q	<i>po-si-p-si-o</i> SH-AH-RQ-IM	<i>po-p-si-ta</i> AH-R-PR-DC

DC: declarative sentence-type suffix
 PR: propositive sentence-type suffix
 AH: addressee honorific suffix
 IN: indicative mood suffix
 POL: polite speech level or suffix
 SH: subject honorific suffix

IM: imperative sentence-type suffix
 Q: interrogative sentence-type suffix
 BLN: blunt speech level or suffix
 INF: infinitive suffix
 RQ: requestive mood suffix

Like English, the Korean language has two ways to report another utterance: direct and indirect speech. Consider (2).

- (2) a. ku-nun 'na-nun ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-**ta**.' hako/lako (mal)hay-ss-ta.
 he-TC 'I-TC yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-DC' QT say-PAST-DC
 He said 'I met Jane yesterday.'
- b. ku-nun [(ku-ka) ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-**ta**]-ko (mal)hay-ss-ta.
 he-TC [he-NM yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-DC]-QT say-PAST-DC
 He said that he met(had met) Jane yesterday.

Indirect speech is followed by the quotative particle *ko* '(saying) that', and then a verb of saying.

What is interesting is that indirect speech has the sentence-type suffix of the reported sentence. That is, while in English, the word order of the reported sentence, which indicates a sentence type, is no longer preserved in indirect speech, in Korean, the sentence-type suffix of the reported sentence, which indicates a sentence type in Korean, is preserved in indirect speech. For example, (2, b) has the declarative sentence-type suffix *ta*, which can also be found in direct speech in (2, a). (Both *ta*'s are in bold for reference in (2)).

We can see more examples in (3) - (5), where each embedded clause of indirect speech has the same sentence-type suffix as the reported speech.

(3) the interrogative

- a. 'ne-nun ecey Jane-ul man-ass-**ni**?'
 you-TC yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-Q
 Did you meet Jane yesterday?
- b. ku-nun [nay-ka ecey Jane-ul man-ass-**nunya**]-ko mwul-ess-ta.
 he-TC [I-NM yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-Q]-QT ask-PAST-DC
 He asked if I met(had met) Jane yesterday.

(4) the imperative

- a. 'tancang ttena-**la**.'
 at-once leave-**IM**
 Leave at once.
- b. ku-nun [tancang ttena-**la**]-ko (mal)hay-ss-ta.
 he-TC [at-once leave-**IM**]-QT say-PAST-DC
 He told (someone) to leave at once.

(5) the propositive

- a. 'nayil ilccik ttena-**ca**.'
tomorrow early leave-**PR**
Let us start early tomorrow.
- b. ku-nun [nayil ilccik ttena-**ca**]-ko (mal)hay-ss-ta.
he-TC [tomorrow early start-**PR**]-QT say-PAST-DC
He suggested that they start early tomorrow.

AC: accusative particle

IM: imperative sentence-type suffix

PR: propositive sentence-type suffix

QT: quotative particle

DC: declarative sentence-type suffix

NM: nominative particle

Q: interrogative sentence-type suffix

TC: topic-contrast particle

Though there are a number of different sentence-type suffixes as we can see in (1), only plain speech level suffixes, *ta* (or *la* after copular verbs) in declarative, *nunya* in interrogative, *la* in imperative, and *ca* in propositive are used before the quotative particle *ko*. In other words, in indirect speech, the speech level of the reported sentence is levelled out.

Echo questions are very similar to indirect speech, except that they have no verb of saying. They have the sentence-type suffix of the echoed utterance, and the quotative particle. Consider the echo questions of (2 a) - (5 a).

- (6) [ney-ka ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-**ta**]-**ko**?
[you-NM yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-**DC**]-**QT**
You met Jane yesterday?
- (7) [nay-ka ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-**nunya**]-**ko**?
[I-NM yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-**Q**]-**DC**
Did I meet Jane yesterday?
- (8) [tangcang ttena-**la**]-**ko**?
[at-once leave-**IM**]-**QT**
Leave at once?
- (9) [nayil ilccik ttena-ca]-**ko**?
[tomorrow early start-**PR**]-**QT**
Let us leave early tomorrow?

AC: accusative particle

IN: indicative mood suffix

PR: propositive sentence-type suffix

DC: declarative sentence-type suffix

NM: nominative particle

Q: interrogative sentence-type suffix

QT: quotative particle

TC: topic-contrast particle

Though the polite level suffix *yo* can be added after *ko*, echo questions are not regarded as a polite form normally. Taylor(1989: 858) says 'An echo question can easily imply an attitude of superiority, which is underlined by the intonation.' Echoing is concerned with failure of hearing or comprehension, or incredulity at what has been said, which will not be regarded as polite.

In Japanese also, echo questions are less formal, which is shown in the fact that only the informal quotative marker *tte* (*to* in formal style) can be used in echo questions. Other aspects are the same as Korean echo questions. Consider (10), from (Hinds 1984: 165)

- (10) a. [dare deshita] tte?
 who was QT
 who (did you say) it was?
- b. [sugu kekkon suru] tte?
 soon marry do QT
 (Did you say) you're getting married soon?

The echo question marker *tte* comes from *tte*(quotative particle)-*iimashita*(said)-*ka*(question marker).

Korean and Japanese echo questions are a variety of indirect speech without a verb of saying. Though they have the same sentence-type suffix as the echoed one, and personal pronouns shifted, just like English echo questions as FIDs, they are not free indirect speech, because of their quotative particles. We can say they are a variety of indirect speech, whose verb of saying is deleted. In fact the deletion is not necessary. Consider (11) (=6)):

- (11) a. [ney-ka ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-**ta**]-**ko**?
 [you-NM yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-**DC**]-**QT**
 You met Jane yesterday?
- b. [ney-ka ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-**ta**]-**ko** malhay-ss-ni?
 [you-NM yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-**DC**]-**QT** say-PAST-Q
 Did you say that you met Jane yesterday?

On the other hand, it seems that this quotative particle *ko* is not obligatory. But deletion is not always possible. An echo question which repeats a prior utterance

without the quotative particle needs some change of suffixes, but is still unusual. Consider (13) - (16):

- (13) A: na-nun ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-ta. (=2 a)
I-TC yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-DC
I met Jane yesterday.

B: ney-ka ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-*ta/e?
you-NM yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-*DC/Q
You met Jane yesterday?

- (14) A: ne-nun ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-ni?
you-TC yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-Q
Did you meet Jane yesterday?

B: nay-ka ecey Jane-ul mana-ss-*ni/*e?
I-NM yesterday Jane-AC meet-PAST-*Q/*Q
Did I meet Jane yesterday?

- (15) A: tangcang ttena-la.
at-once leave-IM
Leave at once.

B: tangcang ttena-la?
at-once leave-IM
Leave at once?

- (16) A: nayil ilccik ttena-ca.
tomorrow early leave-PR
Let's start early tomorrow.

B: nayil ilccik ttena-ca?
tomorrow early leave-PR
Let's start early tomorrow?

Though (15) and (16) are possible, the echo questions with the quotative particle *ko* are much better.

To conclude, Korean echo questions are a variety of indirect speech without a verb of saying.

References

- Banfield, A. 1982. *Unspeakable Sentences*. London; Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Blakemore, D. 1993. The relevance of reformulations, in *Language and Literature* 2 (2). 101 - 120.
- Blakemore, D. 1994. Echo question: A pragmatic account, in *Lingua* 94 No 4, 197-211.
- Bolinger, D. 1957. *Interrogative Structures of American English: The Direct Question*. Publication No. 28 of the American Dialect Society (University of Alabama).
- Bolinger, D. 1978. Yes-No questions are not alternative questions, in Hiz, H., *Questions*. Dordrecht; D.Reidel Publishing Company. 87-105.
- Carston, R. 1994. Metalinguistic negation and echoic use, in *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 6. 321-339. Revised version to appear in *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Chafe, W. L. 1970 *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. Chicago; The University of Chicago Press.
- Collins Cobuild 1990. *English Grammar*.
- Cooper, R. 1983. *Quantification and Syntactic Theory*. Dordrecht; D. Reidel.
- Cruttenden, A. 1986. *Intonation*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne; CUP.
- Hinds, J. 1984. Japanese, in Chisholm Jr., W.S. (ed.) *Interrogativity*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia; John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Horn, L. 1989. *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago; Chicago University Press.
- Huddleston, R. 1984. *An Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne; Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, R. 1994. Interrogatives and questions, in *Journal of Linguistics* 30. 411-439.
- Leech, G.N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London, New York; Longman.
- McCawley, J. D. 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. vol 2. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- McHale, B. 1978. Free indirect discourse: a survey of recent accounts, in *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3. 249-287.
- Noh, E-J. 1994. A pragmatic approach to metalinguistic negation. MA dissertation, UCL.
- Progovac, L. 1993. Negative polarity, entailment and binding, in *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16. 149-180.
- Quirk, R. et al. 1985. *A comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London; Longman.
- Radford, A. 1988. *Transformational Grammar*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne; CUP.
- Sobin, N. 1990. On the syntax of English echo questions, in *Lingua* 81. 141-167.
- Sohn, H.-M. 1994. *Korean - Descriptive Grammars*. Routledge; London. 33-37.
- Sperber, D & Wilson, D. 1986. *Relevance - Communication and Cognition*. Oxford; Blackwell.
- Taylor, J. 1989. Intonation in interaction, in R. Dirven (ed.). *A User's Grammar of English: Word, Sentence, Text, Interaction*. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York; Lang.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. 1988a. Representation and relevance, in R. Kempson (ed.) *Mental Representations*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne; CUP.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber D. 1988b Mood and the analysis of non-declarative sentences, in J.Dancy, J. Moravcsik, C. Taylor (eds.) *Human Agency: Language, Duty and Value*. Stanford, CA; Standard.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. 1992. On verbal irony, in *Lingua* 87. 53-76.