Towards a typology of echo questions

© 2025   **Tatyana V. Simonova**

HSE University, Moscow, Russia; 62tatyana@mail.ru

Abstract: Over the past half century, the analysis of questions has played an important role in the development of the syntactic theory. Despite this, echo questions have been given quite little attention, and most studies on echo questions focused on data from a single language. In this paper, I review strategies of forming echo questions of different types in 32 languages from five macroareas. For this purpose, I used a series of descriptive grammars based on *Lingua Descriptive Studies Questionnaire* designed by Comrie and Smith (1977). I consider an echo question an instance of reported speech but with interrogative illocutionary force and define a derivation strategy as a set of features by which the echo question differs from the stimulus sentence. Each strategy is a combination of the following parameters: 1) the marking of the sentence part that signals quotation (M-part); 2) the marking of an interrogative semantic component; 3) the presence or absence of the pronominal deictic shift. An M-part can be a clause, while the part with the reported content (R-part) can be formally dependent or independent from it. An M-part can also be an affix, clitic, particle or remain unexpressed. An interrogative semantic component is usually expressed by intonation, an interrogative affix, clitic, particle, or pronoun. Among the languages of my sample, the most frequent strategies of forming echo questions are those in which the M-part is not expressed.

Keywords: cross-linguistic sample, echo questions, grammatical typology, interrogative constructions, speech acts

К типологии эхо-вопросов

Татьяна Владиславовна Симонова

Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики»,
Москва, Россия; 62tatyana@mail.ru

Аннотация: За последние полвека важную роль в развитии синтаксической теории сыграли работы, посвященные анализу вопросов, однако исследованию эхо-вопросов уделялось довольно мало внимания. В данной статье я проанализировала материал 32 языков из пяти макроареалов и описала стратегии, которые могут использоваться в этих языках для образования эхо-вопросов разных типов. Данные были взяты из серии описательных грамматик, в основе которых лежит анкета для описательных лингвистических исследований, разработанная Б. Комри и Н. Смитом (1977). Я рассматриваю эхо-вопрос как конструкцию передачи чужой речи, но с вопросительной иллокутивной силой и считаю стратегией образования эхо-вопроса набор свойств, которые отличают его от предложения-стимула. Каждая из стратегий представляет собой комбинацию трех параметров: 1) способ маркирования той части предложения, которая вводит цитату (М-часть); 2) способ маркирования вопросительной

составляющей эхо-вопроса; 3) наличие или отсутствие мены дейктических местоимений. М-часть может быть отдельной клаузой, при этом цитата (R-часть) может оформляться формально зависимой или не зависимой от М-части клаузой. М-часть также может выражаться аффиксом, клитикой, частицей или оставаться невыраженной. Вопросительная часть эхо-вопроса маркируется с помощью интонации или вопросительного элемента (аффикса, клитики или вопросительного слова). Среди языков моей выборки наиболее частотны те стратегии, в которых М-часть остается невыраженной.

Ключевые слова: вопросительные конструкции, грамматическая типология, речевые акты, типологическая выборка, эхо-вопросы

1. Introduction

An echo question is a request to repeat or clarify what has been previously said by the other participant of a dialog. By quoting the words of the addressee, the speaker signals that there is a problem in communication and some clarification is required. Consider (1), in which speaker B did not hear distinctly the place where Mary left her bicycle and decided to ask about it.

(1)   A: Mary left the bicycle at the gate.
        B: Mary left the bicycle *where*?

According to [Mycock 2019: 575], works devoted to the analysis of questions have played an important role in the development of syntactic theory over the past half century (see, e.g., [Chomsky 1977; Karttunen 1997; Ginzburg, Sag 2000]). Despite this, echo questions got little attention. The vast majority of works are based predominantly on English data [Banfield 1982; Huddleston 1994; Sobin 1994; 2010; McCawley 1998]. There are also specific studies of echo questions in Russian [Chernova 2012], Brazil Portuguese [Kato 2019], and Korean [Jang, Caponigro 2022]. The sole typological study on the topic [Mycock 2019] covers just a part of the field — the author presents only the strategies of forming echo questions with interrogative pronouns. Besides, the paper considers only nine languages, so it is possible that some existing strategies are not represented in the sample.

The aim of the article is to survey the diversity of strategies that can be used in languages to form echo questions of different types.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 I introduce possible types of echo questions. Section 3 describes two semantico-syntactic components of echo questions and the way they can be expressed. The data used for this study is presented in Section 4. Section 5 reviews possible strategies of forming echo questions of the types given in Section 2. In Sections 6 and 7 I consider unattested strategies, sum up my observations, and propose some research questions that can expand the study.

2. Types of echo questions

The classifications of echo questions presented in the literature are based on different parameters.

The first parameter is the **qualitative type of an echo question**. Echo questions, like simple questions, can be divided into yes-no (2) and content (3) echo questions.[1] The type depends on the assumed answer: "yes" or "no" in case of yes-no echo questions and the specific information in case of content echo questions [Comrie, Smith 1977; Banfield 1982; Huddleston 1994; Noh 1995; McCawley 1998; Mycock 2019].

(2) A: John didn't go to the cinema.
     B: John didn't go *to the cinema*?
     A: Yes.

(3) B′: John didn't go *where*?
     A: To the cinema.

Another parameter that often provides a basis for classification is the **type of a stimulus sentence**. Five types of echo questions are distinguished depending on the illocutionary force of the previous context: an echo question can be based on an affirmative sentence (2)–(3), question (4), command / imperative (5), exclamation (6), or vocative (7) [Comrie, Smith 1977; Banfield 1982: 124; Huddleston 1994: 427; Noh 1995: 107–108; Sudo 2010: 3].[2]

(4) A: Has Mr Nackybal your leave to sit down?
     B: Has Mr Nackybal our leave to sit down?
     B′: Has *who* our leave to sit down? [Banfield 1982: 124]

(5) A: Open the jealousies.
     B: Open the jealousies?
     B′: Open the *what*? [Ibid.]

(6) A: What blue eyes he has!
     B: What blue *what* he has? [Ibid.]

(7) A: Hey, Sweetie!
     B: Hey, *who / what*? [Huddleston 1994: 428]

Comrie and Smith [1977] and Huddlestone [1994] divide echo questions based on a question into two subgroups depending on the type of the stimulus question: echo questions based on a yes-no question (8) and those based on a content question (9).[3]

(8) A: Did Kim answer the phone?
     B: Did Kim answer the phone?
     B′: Did *who* answer the phone? [Huddlestone 1994: 427]

(9) A: Where did she put the jug?
     B: Where did she put the jug?
     B′: Where did she put *what*? [Ibid.]

One more way to classify echo questions is to consider the **identity between the material of an echo question and its stimulus sentence**. Banfield [1982] distinguishes full echo

---

[1] Huddlestone [1994] and Sudo [2010] also distinguish alternative echo questions, which, according to Huddlestone, are much less frequent than the other two types: A. *Give it to Anne.* — B. *Give it to Anne or Anna?* The authors do not consider them in the following discussion.

[2] Among these options, Comrie and Smith [1977] distinguish only echo questions based on an affirmative sentence and on a question; Banfield [1982] does not distinguish echo questions based on a vocative.

[3] Huddleston [1994] uses the terms "close interrogatives" and "open interrogatives" for yes-no questions and content questions, respectively.

questions (10) that repeat the whole stimulus sentence and partial echo questions (11) that repeat a part of the stimulus sentence. According to her, full echo questions are represented by yes-no echo questions, whereas echo questions with interrogative pronouns should be considered partial echo questions, since they do not exactly repeat the stimulus sentence.

(10) A: Joe could buy a supper.
      B: Joe could buy a supper?

(11) A: Joe saw Bill.
      B: Joe saw *who*?

Banfield does not discuss yes-no echo questions that do not fully repeat the stimulus sentence, as in (12).

(12) A: He gave me flowers.
      B: Flowers?

Based on the definition given above, they are partial, i.e. constitute one class with content echo questions. In (11) the whole stimulus sentence is involved in forming an echo question. The only difference between the stimulus and the question is that the constituent in focus is replaced by an interrogative pronoun. In (12) most of the stimulus sentence is omitted. Thus, the same type includes echo questions that have completely different structures. The classification based solely on the identity of the material may be inconvenient for making further syntactic or semantic generalizations.

McCawley [1998: 561] discusses echo questions as in (12), but does not consider them as a separate type.

Most authors base their classifications on the combination of two parameters: the qualitative type of an echo question and the type of a stimulus sentence [Comrie, Smith 1977; Huddleston 1994; Sudo 2010]. Banfield [1982] also considers the identity between the material of an echo question and a stimulus sentence. McCawley [1998] and Mycock [2019] divide echo questions according to the qualitative type only.

Furthermore, Sobin [1990; 2010] proposes to split content echo questions into '**syntactic**' echo questions (13) and **pseudo** echo questions (14), that is, echo questions that structurally look the same as questions but have different intonation. In English, syntactic echo questions are those in which the question word stays in situ.

(13) A: Bill married Greta Garbo.
      B: Bill married *who* ↑?

(14) B′: Who did Bill marry ↑? [Sobin 1990: 143]

From all of the parameters discussed above, I have chosen three to be used here. The first parameter is the qualitative type of echo question: the yes-no or content echo questions. The second one is the degree of identity between the material of the echo question and the stimulus sentence. If an echo question includes the whole stimulus, I consider it a full echo question (15); if it includes only some part of the stimulus, it is a partial echo question (16).

(15) A: Mary is dating with John.
      B: Mary is dating *with John*?

(16) B′: With John?

If the deictic shift of pronouns happens, e.g., as in (17), or an interrogative pronoun substitutes a constituent, I also consider such echo questions as full despite that, strictly speaking, the identity is not full.

(17)   A: **I** love dancing.
         B: **You** love dancing?
         B′: You love *what*?

    I distinguish between full yes-no echo questions (18) and full content (20) echo questions, as well as partial yes-no (19) and content (21) ones.

(18)   A: I′ll be home at 8:00.
         B: You'll be home at 8:00?

(19)   B′: At eight?

(20)   C: You'll be home *when*?

(21)   C′: When?

    The third parameter is the type of a stimulus sentence. Here I restrict myself to echo questions based on affirmative and interrogative sentences due to the lack of data on other types in the descriptions used in this study. Interrogative stimulus sentences, in turn, are divided into yes-no questions and content questions.
    Thus, I obtain the following classification, where 12 potential types can be identified:

    i) Echo question to a statement

      (a) Yes-no
        1. Full
        2. Partial

      (b) Content
        1. Full
        2. Partial

    ii) Echo question to an interrogative sentence

      (a) To a yes-no question

        1. Yes-no
          i. Full
          ii. Partial

        2. Content
          i. Full
          ii. Partial

      (b) To a content question

        1. Yes-no
          i. Full
          ii. Partial

        2. Content
          i. Full
          ii. Partial

    I consider all of the parameters discussed in the literature to check if their values influence the choice of the strategy of forming echo-questions, except for the distinction between 'syntactic' echo questions and pseudo echo questions as, in fact, it will show the difference between strategies of forming echo questions and ordinary questions. This is the topic for another study.

3. Semantico-syntactic components of echo questions

The type of an echo question can be determined by comparing it with the stimulus sentence. The parameter (e.g. usage of an extra morpheme or a word, change of the word order, replacement of a constituent with an interrogative pronoun, etc.) by which the echo question differs from the stimulus is considered its **derivation strategy**.

Noh [1995] views echo questions in English as an instance of reported speech. The main argument is that echo questions are similar to free indirect speech (23c), which resembles direct speech (23a) in syntactic structure and indirect speech (23b) in the choice of person and tense [Ibid.: 127]. As in (free) indirect speech, in (24) the first-person pronoun is used instead of the second-person pronoun. In contrast to free indirect speech, the tense in echo questions is not back-shifted. Noh explains such difference by the affinity of the echo question with the original utterance.

(22)   Peter to Mary: *Have you ever been to Paris?*

(23)   Reported speech by Mary:
     a. Direct speech: *Peter said to me, "Have you ever been to Paris?"*
     b. Indirect speech: *Peter asked me if I had ever been to Paris.*
     c. Free indirect speech: *Peter asked me, **had I ever been to Paris?***

(24)   Echo question by Mary: ***Have I ever been to Paris?*** [Noh 1995: 127]

I consider echo questions an instance of reported speech with interrogative illocutionary force.[4] Unlike Noh, I take a functional rather than syntactic perspective. On the one hand, while constructing an echo question, the speaker repeats the words of another conversation participant and therefore reports his / her speech. On the other hand, the speaker does it to clarify the stimulus sentence, so his / her utterance needs to be answered, and that is why it is interrogative. Each of these two functions can be encoded by different grammatical means.[5]

The change in intonation is used to code the interrogativity of the echo question in most cases. If it is the only means by which the interrogative part of the echo question is marked, I consider this parameter to be a part of the strategy.

The other way of coding an interrogative semantic component is to use some other interrogative marker in addition to intonation. For example, a full yes-no echo question based on a stimulus yes-no question requires an interrogative particle in Hungarian (25) and Vengo (26). In such cases, I view the marker as forming the strategy on its own.

(25)   Hungarian (< Uralic) [Kenesei et al. 1998: 13]
     A: *be-mész   az   iskolá-ba?*
        pfx-go.2sg   art.def   school-ill
     'Are you going in the school?'

     B: *be-megyek   *(=e)   az   iskolá-ba?*
        pfx-go.1sg   =q   art.def   school-ill
     'Am I going in the school?'

---

[4] In English, full yes-no echo questions to the sentence *I saw Mary yesterday* usually look like a) *You saw Mary yesterday?* However, one can clarify the stimulus utterance by asking b) *Did you say, "I saw Mary yesterday?"* The second question is more similar to reported speech constructions than to echo questions. Despite this, I consider examples like (b) echo questions if they can function this way as in some languages it is the only means to form an echo question.

[5] They do not necessarily coincide with grammatical means that are used in other reported speech constructions or non-echo questions. For example, in Imbabura Quechua (< Quechuan) yes-no non-echo

(26) Vengo (< Atlantic-Congo) [Schaub 1985: 17]

> A: *mà   gə́   táa   yìwìŋ   ndée*
>   1SG   go.IMPF   to   market   today
>   'I am going to the market today.'

> B: *à   gə́   táa   yìwìŋ   ndée   **mū***
>   2SG   go.IMPF   to   market   today   Q
>   'You are going to the market today?'

In content echo questions, phrases are substituted for interrogative pronouns. I consider them question markers and hence a means of expressing the interrogative nature of the echo question.

Interrogative pronouns can occur in situ (i.e. in the place of the phrase they substitute) (27) or in a focus position typical for the interrogative pronoun such as the initial position in the clause (28) or the one immediately before the predicate (29).

(27) Catalan (< Indo-European) [Hualde 1992: 21]

> A: *vaig   al   port*
>   go.1SG   to.the   harbor
>   'I'm going to the harbor.'

> B: *(dius   que)   vas   a   **on** ?*
>   say.2SG   that   go.2SG   to   where
>   '(You say that) you are going where?'

> A: *al   port*
>   to.the   harbor
>   'To the harbor.'

(28) Hixkaryána (< Cariban) [Derbyshire 1979: 13]

> A: *omuru   wenyako   domenku   ho*
>   your_son   I_saw_him   Sunday   on
>   'I saw your son on Sunday.'

> B: ***isokentoko**   menyako*
>   when   you_saw_him
>   'When did you see him?'

(29) Kashmiri (< Indo-European) [Wali, Koul 1997: 30]

> A: *su   chu   ciṭh'   le:kha:n*
>   he   is   letter   writing
>   'He is writing a letter.'

> B: *su   **k'a:**↑   chu   le:kha:n?*
>   he   what   is   writing
>   'What is he writing?'

> A: *ciṭh'*
>   letter
>   'A letter.'

The position of interrogative pronouns in echo questions and non-echo questions can differ. In both types of questions, they can occur only in situ, only ex situ, or in both positions. However, not all nine combinations of these positions are possible. There is no language in my sample in which interrogative pronouns can move to the left periphery in echo questions only (Table 1).

---

questions are formed by an interrogative suffix *-chu*. Yes-no echo questions based on an affirmative sentence are formed only by change in intonation [Cole 1982: 15, 27].

The language with interrogative pronouns occurring ex situ in non-echo questions and in / ex situ in echo questions is also unattested. Thus, interrogative pronouns in content echo questions can either be in the same positions as in non-echo questions or remain in situ.

Table 1

The position of interrogative pronouns in (non-)echo questions

Non-echo questions	Echo questions	Languages[6]
in situ	in situ	Vengo, Nigerian Pidgin, Nkore-Kiga, Panjabi, Persian, Japanese
in situ	ex situ	
in situ	in / ex situ	
ex situ	in situ	Amele, Catalan, Turkish, Ndyuka, Modern Greek
ex situ	ex situ	Hungarian, Kashmiri, Hixkaryána
ex situ	in / ex situ	
in / ex situ	in situ	Koromfé, Tuvalu, Cairene Arabic, Korean
in / ex situ	ex situ	
in / ex situ	in / ex situ	Finnish, Gulf Arabic

The second component discussed here is related to reported speech strategies which are used to form echo questions in the languages of the sample.

In reported speech constructions, there are two parts: an utterance that is reported (R) and the element which indexes the reported speaker (M, which stands for 'matrix'[7]) [Spronck, Nikitina 2019: 125–126]. One can observe variation in how each part is expressed and in the way they are connected.

Spronck [2017], following [Güldemann 2008], defines M as a 'quotative index', i.e., "a segmentally discrete linguistic expression which is used by the reporter for the orientation of the audience to signal in his / her discourse the occurrence of an adjacent representation of reported discourse".

According to [Spronck, Nikitina 2019: 125–129], M can be a clause (30) or an affix (31). Sometimes reported speech constructions can lack an M-part. In (32), the clause 'I went to them' introduces the reported speaker to which the following reported speech clause is attributed. Instead of pronouncing a full M-clause (which can be expressed by a verb 'say, do' in Ngarinyin), the speaker makes a pause and adds the pronoun *ngin* 'I' for clarification.

(30) **He said:** 'I'll be home by 11 p. m.'

(31) MEGEB (< NAKH-DAGHESTANIAN) [Ganenkov 2010: 1]
    ca   *adaj-la*   *k'ʷi-jal*   *urši*   *le-b-re-k'ʷ-an*
    one   father-GEN   TWO-CARD   son   COP-HPL-PST-HS
    'A father had (they say) two sons.'

(32) NGARINYIN (< WORRORRAN) [Spronck 2017: 126]
    balya   *bungoni*   [*anjaku*   *murlnbun*   *kujilennyina*]   *ngin*
    balya   bunga$_2$-w$_1$-u-ni   [anja-ku   murlnbun   kurr-y$_1$ila-n-y$_1$i-na   ngin
    go   3PL.O:1SG.S-act.on-PST   [what-DAT   argue   2PL-hold-PRS-REFL-PAUC]   1SG
    'I went to them, "Why are you arguing with each other?" … Me.'

---

[6] The position of an interrogative pronoun in (non-)echo questions is given in 20 out of 32 grammars of the languages in my sample.

[7] The authors do not explain the choice of this term. It was first introduced in [Spronck 2017] for analyzing the Ngarinyin reported speech constructions. Originally, M stood for a matrix clause only, but later for the purposes of the paper Spronck applies it to morphemes, clitics, and particles [Spronck 2017: 12].

According to [Spronck, Nikitina 2019: 128], "the absence of M is not semantic absence". The language allows one to add explicit M-marking, if necessary. Spronck and Nikitina refer to such M-less clauses as 'defenestrated'.

As echo questions resemble reported speech constructions functionally, I decided to divide them into the same two parts: a reported utterance (R) and an element that indexes the reported speaker (M).

The strategies of expressing the M-part that Spronck and Nikitina distinguish in reported speech constructions are observed in echo questions, too.

In (33), the M-part is represented by a separate clause (the verb *andir* 'say'); in (34), the M-part is expressed by a particle. The echo question in (35) can be considered as an example of a construction in which the M-part is unexpressed: the interlocutor whose speech is echoed is clear from the context. As echo questions are usually used in the dialog, where the time gap between the utterance of the interlocutor and its report is quite little, it is not necessary to indicate it additionally.

(33) KANNADA (< DRAVIDIAN); full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question

A: *maLe   baratt=a:?*
   rain   come.PST.3SG.N=Q
'Will it rain?'

B: *'maLe   baratt=a:?'   **andir**=a:?*
   rain   come.PST.3SG.N=Q   say.PST.2.HORT=Q
'Did you say, "Will it rain?"' [Sridhar 1990: 26]

(34) MALAYALAM (< DRAVIDIAN); full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question

A: *niŋŋaɭ   sinimaykkə   pookukayaaŋ=oo*
   you   cinema.DAT   go.IMPF.PRS=Q
'Are you going to the cinema?'

B: *ɲaan   sinimaykkə   pookukayaaŋ=oo   **enn**=oo*
   I   cinema.DAT   go.IMPF.PRS=Q   QUOT=Q
'Am I going to the cinema?' [Asher, Kumari 2013: 24]

(35) MALTESE (< SEMITIC); full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question

A: *fi   x'   hin   se   tmorru?*
   in   what   time   FUT   go.2PL
'At what time are you leaving?'

B: *fi   x'   hin   se   mmorru?*
   in   what   time   FUT   go.1PL
'At what time are we leaving?' [Borg, Azzopardi-Alexander 2013: 24]

Consider now the syntactic features of the R-clauses which are relevant for echo questions.

Firstly, there is variation in expressing deictic elements, such as tense and pronouns in reported speech constructions [Spronck, Nikitina 2019: 130]. For example, in English, tense values and temporal adverbials undergo deictic shift in reported speech (36), while this does not happen in direct speech constructions (37). In Russian only temporal adverbials are changed (38).

(36) John said yesterday that he would leave today.

(37) John said yesterday, "I shall leave tomorrow."

(38) RUSSIAN (< INDO-EUROPEAN) [Spronck, Nikitina 2019: 130]

a. *Včera   Džon   skazal,   "Ja   uedu   zavtra".*
   yesterday J.   said   I   go.NPST.1SG tomorrow
'Yesterday John said, "I shall leave tomorrow."'

b. *Včera   Džon   skazal,   čto   uedet   **segodnja**.*
　　yesterday　J.　　said　　that　go.NPST.3SG　today

　　'Yesterday John said that he would leave today.'

Besides, these examples illustrate that both in Russian and English personal pronouns can undergo deictic shift. The deictic shift happens in indirect speech constructions: the first-person pronoun in the R-clause alternates with the third person pronoun in indirect speech, cf. (36), (38), depending on the type of reported speech construction. This is reflected in changing the first-person pronoun to the third-person pronoun in the R-clause.

The expression of the deictic shift with deictic pronouns varies across languages and constructions. For instance, Wan language uses logophoric pronouns to refer to the reported speaker:

(39)　WAN (< NIGER-CONGO) [Nikitina 2012: 289]
　　*ké   lā   zò-á   **ɓā**   biàgà   nὲ   zὲ̄   zānā̄   dì*
　　if　2SG　come-STAT.PF　LOG.SG　wake　PURP　word　true　say

　　[He said] 'If you've come to wake me up, tell the truth.'

In echo questions, only the pronominal deictic shift has been attested, in particular, changing of the first-person pronoun to the second-person pronoun and vice versa, e.g., in (40) speaker B repeats what speaker A has said and replaces a first-person pronoun with a second-person pronoun.

(40)　AMELE (< NUCLEAR TRANS NEW GUINEA) [Roberts 1987: 35]
　　A: ***ija**   Danben   nu-ig-en*
　　　　1SG　Danben　go-1SG-FUT

　　　'I will go to Danben'.

　　B: ***hina**   Danben   nu-eg-an   fo?*
　　　　2SG　Danben　go-2SG-FUT　Q

　　　'You are going to Danben?'

There are also constructions where personal pronouns remain the same as in stimulus sentence, cf. the full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence in Turkish (41). I do not find any examples of temporal deictic shift in echo questions. Probably, this is due to the fact that the time interval between the stimulus sentence and the echo question is very small.

(41)　TURKISH (< TURKIC) [Kornfilt 1997: 32]
　　A: *sinema-ya   gid-iyor-um*
　　　　cinema-DAT　go-PRS.PROG-1SG

　　　'I am going to the movies.'

　　B: *sinema-ya   gid-iyor-um   mu   de-di-n?*
　　　　cinema-DAT　go-PRS.PROG-1SG　Q　say-PST-2SG

　　　'Did you say, "I am going to the movies?"'

The third component of reported speech constructions is a means by which an M-part and an R-part are bound into one syntactic unit. Spronck [2017], following [McGregor 1994], argues that this relation can be considered neither as coordination / parataxis nor as subordination / hypotaxis. Probably, the same is true for echo questions in which the M-part is expressed by a separate clause, but the language descriptions considered in this study are not detailed enough to break the tie. That is why I suggest distinguishing between echo-question constructions where the R-part is formally subordinated to the M-part and echo-question constructions where the R-part is formally independent. By that I mean the presence or absence of subordinating conjunctions or subordinate verb forms. When the M-part is expressed by an affix, a clitic, or a particle, this parameter is irrelevant since the quotative element is completely integrated into the R-part.

Thus, an echo question derivation strategy is a combination of 1) the way of expressing the M-part, 2) the changes that occur in the R-part (i.e. pronominal deictic shift), and 3) the way of coding the interrogative component of the echo question.

4. Methods and data

This study is based on data of 32 languages from five macroareas. To collect it, I used a series of descriptive grammars that were based on *Lingua Descriptive Studies (LDS) Questionnaire* [Comrie, Smith 1977]. I have chosen them because they contain a separate section describing echo questions.

Comrie and Smith define an echo question as a question that clarifies what was said earlier. The questionnaire captures seven issues:

1) The yes-no echo question based on a declarative sentence ("yes-no echo question"):

(42) A: I'm going to the harbour.
      B: (You're going) to the harbour? [Comrie, Smith 1977: 2]

2) The content echo question based on a declarative sentence (43) or on a content question (44) ("question-word echo question"):

(43) A: I'm going to the harbour.
      B: (You're going) where? [Ibid.]

(44) A: Why is Bill shooting at the tin?
      B: Why is who shooting at what? [Ibid.]

3) The yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question ("yes-no question echo question"):

(45) A: Are you going to the harbour?
      B: Am I going to the harbour? I suppose so. [Ibid.]

4) The yes-no echo question based on a content question ("question-word question echo question"):

(46) A: Where are you going?
      B: Where am I going? To the harbour. [Ibid.]

5) Can all elements of the sentence be subject to echo-questioning? Which cannot?

6) Can more than one element at a time be subject to echo-questioning? If so, are there any restrictions?

7) How are the different elements (i.e. different word-types) questioned?

Comrie and Smith do not represent all the possible types of echo questions in this questionnaire. For instance, the questionnaire does not contain echo questions based on an imperative, exclamation, or vocative. There is also no example of a content echo question based on a yes-no question, although it would have been logical to include it in the questionnaire, as yes-no echo questions based on a yes-no question (45) and the ones based on a content question (46) are considered.

Besides, the authors do not expound what kind of clarification they mean in the definition of echo questions. However, it is important because in some languages the strategy of forming an echo question depends on the reason of clarification. For example, in Abkhaz, if speaker is not sure whether he / she heard what was said correctly, he / she uses an interrogative particle *ba* to form an echo question. If speaker is surprised by what he / she heard and wants to get a confirmation that what was said is really true, he / she uses an interrogative suffix *-w* [Hewitt 1979: 22]. Unfortunately, it is the only language in my sample for which this difference is pointed out.

The sample of languages used in the study

Language	Glottocode	Family	Macroarea	Grammar
Abkhaz	abkh1244	Abkhaz-Adyghe	Eurasia	[Hewitt 1979]
Amele	amel1241	Trans New Guinea	Papuanesia	[Roberts 1987]
Catalan	stan1289	Indo-European	Eurasia	[Hualde 1992]
Cairene Arabic	cair1238	Afro-Asiatic	Africa	[Gary, Gamal-Eldin 1982]
Evenki	even1259	Tungusic	Eurasia	[Nedjalkov 1997]
Finnish	finn1318	Uralic	Eurasia	[Sulkala, Karjalainen 1992]
Gulf Arabic	gulf1241	Afro-Asiatic	Eurasia	[Holes 1990]
Hixkaryána	hixk1239	Cariban	South America	[Derbyshire 1979]
Hungarian	hung1274	Uralic	Eurasia	[Kenesei et al. 1998]
Imbabura Quechua	imba1240	Quechuan	South America	[Cole 1982]
Japanese	nucl1643	Japonic	Eurasia	[Hinds 1986]
Kannada	nucl1305	Dravidian	Eurasia	[Sridhar 1990]
Kashmiri	kash1277	Indo-European	Eurasia	[Wali, Koul 1997]
Kobon	kobo1249	Trans New Guinea	Papuanesia	[Davies 1981]
Korean	kore1280	Koreanic	Eurasia	[Sohn 2020]
Koromfé	koro1298	Atlantic-Congo	Africa	[Rennison 1997]
Malayalam	mala1464	Dravidian	Eurasia	[Asher, Kumari 2013]
Maltese	malt1254	Afro-Asiatic	Eurasia	[Borg, Azzopardi-Alexander 2013]
Maori	maor1246	Austronesian	Papuanesia	[Bauer et al. 1993]
Marathi	mara1378	Indo-European	Eurasia	[Pandharipande 1997]
Modern Greek	mode1248	Indo-European	Eurasia	[Joseph, Philippaki-Warburton 1987]
Nigerian Pidgin	nige1257	Indo-European	Africa	[Faraclas 1996]
Ndyuka-Trio Pidgin	ndyu1241	Pidgin	South America	[Huttar, Huttar 1994]
Panjabi	panj1256	Indo-European	Eurasia	[Bhatia 1993]
Persian	west2369	Indo-European	Eurasia	[Mahootian, Gebhardt 1997]
Rapanui	rapa1244	Austronesian	Papuanesia	[Du Feu 1996]
Tamil	tami1289	Dravidian	Eurasia	[Asher 1989]
Turkish	nucl1301	Turkic	Eurasia	[Kornfilt 1997]
Tuvalu	tuva1244	Austronesian	Eurasia	[Besnier 2002]
Vengo	veng1238	Atlantic-Congo	Africa	[Schaub 1985]
Wari'	wari1268	Chapacuran	South America	[Everett, Kern 1997]
West Greenlandic	west2864	Pidgin	North America	[Fortescue 1984]

Only questions 1–4 from the questionnaire are relevant for the purposes of this study. The authors of grammars cover these questions with different degree of detail, which raises the problem of comparing languages and making meaningful statistical generalizations. For example, some authors provide examples of partial yes-no echo-questions based on a yes-no question

[Sridhar 1990; Du Feu 1996] or explicitly state that they do not exist [Derbyshire 1979; Davies 1981], while others do not mention this type at all [Schaub 1985; Roberts 1987; Hualde 1992; Kenesei et al. 1998]. This may be due to the design of the questionnaire. Examples (42) and (43) contain parts in parentheses. It implies that the researcher should check whether it is possible to omit part of the stimulus sentence in an echo question or not. In example (45), the parentheses are absent and most of the researchers do not consider partial yes-no echo-questions based on a yes-no echo question at all.

That is why I consider the typology of constructions, i.e. what configurations are reported, without attempting to determine their cross-linguistic frequency.

The sample of languages (see Table 2, p. 18) used in this paper is not balanced, since I depend on the inventory of descriptions based on a specific scheme. I have found 34 LDS grammars and used 32 of them. I excluded Mangarrayi out of my sample because the author provides general information about echo questions without describing individual types [Merlan 1989: 8]. I also do not consider Romanian [Mallinson 1986: 17–20] because examples in the chapter on echo questions do not contain stimulus sentences, which are necessary to determine the type of echo questions.

Out of 32 languages, the majority (19 languages) belongs to Eurasia, there are 4 languages from Papuanesia, 4 languages from Africa, 4 languages from South America, and 1 language from North America.

5. Attested strategies of forming echo questions

I divided the strategies into four groups depending on the way of expressing the M-part.

The first group of strategies are those in which M-part is a separate clause with a verb of saying and R-clause is formally dependent, i.e. contains a subordinating conjunction or subordinate verb form. The interrogative component can be expressed by intonation (47) or an affix, clitic, or a particle (48) in case of yes-no echo questions and an interrogative pronoun in case of content echo questions (49). Pronominal deictic shift is attested in all the sample languages that use these constructions to form echo questions.

(47) Vengo (< Atlantic-Congo); full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question

A: *à   gə́   táa   yìwìŋ   mū*
   2sg   go.impf   to   market   q
   'Are you going to the market?'

B: ***à   bítə́   lāa   mὲ   gə́   táa   yìwìŋ   mū***
   2sg   ask.impf   that   1sg   go.impf   to   market   q
   'Did you ask whether I am going to the market?' [Schaub 1985: 19]

(48) Kashmiri (< Indo-European); full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question

A: *tɔhi   pərva: kita:b?*
   you.erg   read.f.sg.pst   book.sg
   'Did you read the book?'

B: ***toh'   chiv   pritsha:n   (zi)   me   pər=a: kita:b↑?***
   you   are   asking   that   I   read=q   book.sg
   'You are asking that did I read a book?' [Wali, Koul 1997: 32]

(49) Catalan (< Indo-European); full / partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence

A: *vaig   al   port*
   go.1sg   to.the   harbor
   'I'm going to the harbor'.

B: *(dius   que)   vas   a   on* ?
   say.2SG   that   go.2SG   to   where
'(You say that) you are going where?'

A: *al   port*
  to.the   harbor
'To the harbor'. [Hualde 1992: 21] (=(27))

The second group of strategies differs from the first one in that the R-part is formally independent. In this group there are languages with no pronominal deictic shift, e.g., Amele, in which the interrogative component is expressed by intonation (50), and Turkish, in which an interrogative particle is used (51).

(50)   AMELE (< NUCLEAR TRANS NEW GUINEA) [Roberts 1987: 35]
A: *jo   i   qa   Wagol   ceh-it-en*
  house   this   but   Wagol   build-1SG-3SG.REMPST
'But Wagol build this house for me'.

B: *Wagol   ceh-it-en   ag-a*
  Wagol   build-1SG-3SG.REMPST   2SG-IP
'You said, "Wagol build it for me?"'

(51)   TURKISH (< TURKIC) [Kornfilt 1997: 32]
A: *sinema-ya   gid-iyor-um*
  cinema-DAT   go-PRS.PROG-1SG
'I am going to the movies.'

B: *sinema-ya   gid-iyor-um   mu   de-di-n?*
  cinema-DAT   go-PRS.PROG-1SG   Q   say-PST-2SG
'Did you say, "I am going to the movies?"' (=(41))

The next group consists of strategies in which M is an affix, clitic, or a particle. As the previous two groups, this group includes strategies in which the interrogative component is expressed by intonation (52) or a special morpheme (53)–(54). Languages without pronominal deictic shift are not attested in this group.

(52)   JAPANESE (< JAPONIC); full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question
A: *foodo   wa   saisen   saremasu   ka?*
  Ford   TOP   reelect   do.PASS.POLITE   Q
'Will Ford be reelected?'

B: *foodo   wa   saisen   sareru*[8]   *ka   tte?*
  Ford   TOP   reelect   do.PASS   Q   QUOT
'"Will ford be reelected?", did you say?' [Hinds 1986: 42]

(53)   MALAYALAM (< DRAVIDIAN); full yes-no echo question based on a content question
A: *eviṭe   pooṇu*
  where   go.PRS
'Where are (you) going?'

B: *eviṭe   pooṇu   enn=oo?*
  where   go.PRS   PTCL.QUOT=Q
'Where am I going?' [Asher, Kumari 2013: 25]

---

[8] The politeness distinction in echo questions can be obliterated [Hinds 1986: 41].

(54) HUNGARIAN (< URALIC); full content question based on an affirmative sentence

A: *Anna   megtalálta   a   választ.*
   Anna   PFX.found.DEF   the   answer.ACC

'Anna found the answer.'

B: *(Hogy)   Anna   **mit**   talált   meg?*
   that   Anna   what.ACC   found   PFX

'Anna found what?' [Kenesei et al. 1998: 12]

The last group consists of the strategies lacking M-part ('defenestrated' clauses). The derivation happens either by the change of intonation (55) only or by adding an interrogative element (56)–(57).

(55) HIXKARYÁNA (< CARIBAN); full / partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence

A: *tuna   yohokoso   itehe*
   water   to_edge_of   go.1SG

'I'm going to the river bank'

B: *(tuna   yohokoso)   miteno*
   water   to_edge_of   go.2SG

'You're going (to the river bank)?' [Derbyshire 1979: 12]

(56) TURKISH (< TURKIC); full yes-no echo question based on a content question

A: *yann   akşam   nere-ye   gid-ecek-sin*
   tomorrow   evening   where-DAT   go-FUT-2SG

'Where will you go tomorrow evening?'

B: *yann   akşam   nere-ye   **mi**   gid-eceğ-im*
   tomorrow   evening   where-DAT   Q   go-FUT-1SG

'Where will I go tomorrow evening?' [Kornfilt 1997: 35]

(57) KOROMFÉ (< ATLANTIC-CONGO); partial content echo-question based on an affirmative sentence

A: *sã   mə   jakaa   tubre*
   tomorrow   1SG   walk.DUR   into_the_bush

'I will leave for the bush tomorrow'.

B: *n   jakaa   **nde***
   2SG   walk.DUR   where

'Where will you leave for?' [Rennison 1997: 31]

Table 3 (p. 22) shows the echo-question strategies employed for different types of echo questions in the sample languages. Languages which allow pronominal deictic shift are given in bold, languages lacking deictic shift are italicized and underlined.[9] The remaining languages are those for which the value of this parameter is not specified in the consulted grammars.

A language may use more than one strategy for forming a particular type of an echo question because there is often an option to use a simple question as an echo question.

Not all types of echo questions have a detailed description. Six of the twelve types are illustrated by almost no data in the consulted grammars. Table 4 (p. 24) shows the number of languages in which each type of an echo question is attested, prohibited, or undescribed. Thus, due to the lack of data, I exclude from further consideration the following types of echo questions:

---

[9] The obligatoriness of the pronominal deictic shift in the sample languages or of its absence cannot be proved as there are no relevant data.

partial yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question, full content echo question based on a yes-no question, partial content echo question based on a yes-no question.

Table 3

Strategies of forming echo questions

Coding of an M-part	Coding of an interrogative component		
	Intonation	Interrogative element	
		Affix / clitic / particle	Interrogative pronoun
Separate clause	**R-clause is formally dependent** — full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (**Amele, Catalan, Nigerian Pidgin**, **Persian**) full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (**Nigerian Pidgin, Panjabi, Vengo** (47)) full yes-no echo question based on a content question (**Catalan, Tuvalu**)	full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (**Nigerian Pidgin**) full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (**Catalan, Kashmiri** (48), **Ndyuka, Nigerian Pidgin**)	full content echo question based on an affirmative sentence (**Catalan** (49))
	R-clause is formally independent — full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (*Amele* (50), **Nigerian Pidgin**, Rapanui) full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (**Evenki**)	full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (*Turkish* (51)) partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Evenki, Kannada, Nigerian Pidgin, *Turkish*) full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (Kannada, **Kashmiri**)	partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Turkish)
Affix / clitic / particle	full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Cairene Arabic, **Catalan**, Japanese, **Korean**) partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Cairene Arabic, Japanese) full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (**Finnish**, Japanese (52), **Korean**) partial yes-no echo question based on a content question (Japanese)	full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (**Catalan, Hungarian, Malayalam**) full yes-no echo question based on a content question (**Hungarian**, Malayalam (53))	full content echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Cairene Arabic, **Hungarian** (54), Japanese, **Korean**) partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Japanese) full content echo question based on a yes-no question (Korean) full content echo question based on a content question (**Catalan, Hungarian**, Korean)

Coding of an M-part	Coding of an interrogative component		
	Intonation	Interrogative element	
		Affix / clitic / particle	Interrogative pronoun
'Defenestrated'	full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (**Catalan**, **Finnish**, **Gulf Arabic**, **Hixkaryána** (55), **Hungarian**, Kashmiri, **Kobon**, **Korean**, **Koromfé**, Malayalam, Maltese, Maori, Marathi, Modern Greek, Ndyuka, Panjabi, **Persian**, Rapanui, **Tamil**, **Tuvalu**, **Wari'**, West Greenlandic) partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Finnish, **Gulf Arabic**, **Hungarian**, **Hixkaryána**, Imbabura Quechua, Kashmiri, **Kobon**, **Korean**, Malayalam, Maori, Marathi, Modern Greek, Ndyuka, Panjabi, Persian, Rapanui, Tamil, **Wari'**, West Greenlandic) full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (**Amele**, **Cairene Arabic**, **Finnish**, **Gulf Arabic**, **Maltese**, Marathi, **Maori**, **Modern Greek**, **Panjabi**, **Persian, Tamil**, **West Greenlandic**) partial yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (Rapanui, Ndyuka, Modern Greek) full yes-no echo question based on a content question (**Cairene Arabic**, **Evenki**, **Gulf Arabic**, **Hungarian**, **Maltese**, **Maori**, Ndyuka, **Nigerian Pidgin**, **Panjabi**, **Persian**, **Rapanui**, **Tamil**, **West Greenlandic**)	full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (**Amele**, **Finnish**, **Gulf Arabic**, **Koromfé**, **Vengo**) partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Abkhaz, Finnish, **Gulf Arabic**, Turkish, **Vengo**) full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (**Abkhaz**, Finnish, **Hungarian**, **Kashmiri**, **Turkish**) partial yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question (**Kannada**) full yes-no echo question based on a content question (**Abkhaz**, **Kannada**, **Turkish** (56))	full content echo question based on an affirmative sentence (**Cairene Arabic**, **Catalan**, **Evenki**, **Finnish**, Gulf Arabic, **Hixkaryána**, **Hungarina**, Kashmiri, Kobon, **Koromfé**, **Maori**, Marathi, Modern Greek, Kannada, Ndyuka, Nigerian Pidgin, **Panjabi**, **Persian**, **Tamil**, Tuvalu, Wari') partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence (Abkhaz, Cairene Arabic, **Hixkaryána**, Imbabura Quechua, Kobon, Koromfé, Malayalam, Maltese, Mangarrayi, Maori, Nigerian Pidgin, Panjabi, Persian, Rapanui, **Tamil**, Tuvalu, Vengo, Wari', West Greenlandic) full content echo question based on a yes-no question (Amele) full content echo question based on a content question (Amele, **Catalan**, **Hungarian**, **Kashmiri**, Ndyuka, **Persian**)

Table 4

Types of echo questions and the languages in which they are attested

Type of the echo question	The number of languages in which this type of echo question is attested	The number of languages in which this type of echo question is prohibited	The number of languages for which there is no data about this type of echo question
Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	28	0	4
Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	25	0	7
Full content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	25	0	7
Partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	21	0	11
Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	27	4	1
Partial yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	5	3	24
Full content echo question based on a yes-no question	3	3	26
Partial content echo question based on a yes-no question	0	2	30
Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	26	3	3
Partial yes-no echo question based on a content question	27	5	0
Full content echo question based on a content question	21	2	9
Partial content echo question based on a content question	0	2	30

Table 5[10] (p. 25) shows that among the remaining types of echo questions the most used strategies are those with defenestrated M-clause. In case of full and partial yes-no echo questions based on an affirmative sentence and full yes-no echo questions based on a content question, a change in intonation marks an interrogative component. In case of full and partial content echo questions based on an affirmative sentence, an interrogative pronoun fulfills this function.

There is no dominant strategy of forming a full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question. However, there is a tendency not to use a strategy where only intonation is changed. 15 out of 27 languages have at least one strategy with expressed M-part or interrogative component. Using this kind of strategies allows one to better discern an echo questions from a non-echo question and from the stimulus sentence.[11]

---

[10] In Table 5 I neglect a parameter of pronominal deictic shift as it is possible in almost all cases. The exceptions are full and partial yes-no echo questions based on an affirmative sentence in Turkish and full yes-no echo questions based on an affirmative sentence in Amele.

[11] It is not clear why this tendency is not observed among full yes-no echo questions based on a content question.

Table 5

The number of languages that use a strategy to form each type of echo questions[12]

Coding of the M-part		Coding of an interrogative component					
		Intonation		Interrogative element (Affix / clitic / particle)		Interrogative pronoun	
Separate clause	R-clause is formally dependent	Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	4	Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	1	Full content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	1
		Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	0	Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	0	Partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	0
		Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	3	Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	3		
		Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	2	Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	2		
	R-clause is formally independent	Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	3	Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	1	Full content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	0
		Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	0	Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	0	Partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	1
		Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	1	Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	2		
		Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	0	Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	0		
Affix / clitic / particle		Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	4	Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	2	Full content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	4
		Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	2	Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	2	Partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	0
		Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	2	Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	3		
		Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	0	Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	2		
'Defenestrated'		Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	22	Full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	5	Full content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	21
		Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	19	Partial yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence	5	Partial content echo question based on an affirmative sentence	19
		Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	11	Full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no question	5		
		Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	13	Full yes-no echo question based on a content question	3		

---

[12] Excluding the deictic shift in pronouns.

6. Unaccounted patterns

Imbabura Quechua uses an unusual strategy to form echo questions based on yes-no and content questions: the linguistic material is not added, but rather removed. For example, in (58) the interrogative suffix -*chu*[13] used in the stimulus sentence is omitted in the echo question.

(58) IMBABURA QUECHUA (< QUECHUAN) [Cole 1982: 28]
      A: *fishta-man-chu   ri-ju-ngui*
         festival-to-Q   go-PROG-2SG
         'Are you going to festival?'

      B: *fishta-man(-*chu)   ri-ju-ngui*
         festival-to-Q   go-PROG-2SG
         'Am I going to the festival?'

The removing strategy is also observed in Japanese. In (59) an interrogative particle *no* is absent in the echo question. Note that another question particle *ka* is retained in (52), but Hinds [1986] does not explain this variation.

(59) JAPANESE (< JAPONIC) [Hinds 1986: 28]
      A: *konban   shebon   ni ikimasu   no?*
         tonight   Chez_Yvonne to go.POLITE   Q
         'Are [you] going to Chez Yvonne tonight?'

      B: *shebon   ni iku   tte? mo   yameta   n   da   yo*
         Chez_Yvonne to go   QUOT already   quit   NOM   COP   EMPH
         'Did you say am I going to Chez-Yvonne? [I]'ve stopped going there.'

The same pattern is observed in Kashmiri. In (60) an interrogative pronoun moves into the preverbal position, while the interrogative marker is removed.

(60) KASHMIRI (< INDO-EUROPEAN); full yes-no echo question to a yes-no question
      A: *aslam ch=a: siriph kə:shur bo:la:n?*
         Aslam be=Q   only   Kashmiri speaking
         'Does Aslam speak only Kashmiri?'

      B: *aslam   k'a:↑   chu: siriph bo:la:n?*[14]
         Aslam   what   be   only   speaking
         'Aslam only speaks what ↑?'

      B': **aslam   ch=a: siriph k'a:↑ bo:la:n?*
          Aslam   be=Q   only   what   speaking
          'Aslam only speaks what ↑?' [Wali, Koul 1997: 31]

Another interesting case is a full yes-no echo question based on an affirmative sentence in Nkore-Kiga. In (61) the M-part is omitted, while the R-clause becomes non-finite: the subjunctive or other subordinate verb form is used.

---

[13] In full content echo questions based on content questions, the interrogative suffix -*taj*, which is attached to the interrogative pronoun, is also omitted.

[14] The same sentence can be an echo question to the affirmative statement *Aslam speaks only Kashmiri*. Thus, a content echo question based on a yes-no question and an echo question based on an affirmative sentence cannot be distinguished.

(61) NKORE-KIGA (< ATLANTIC-KONGO) [Taylor 1985: 10]
 A: *n-oo-za*   *Mbarara*
   PTCL-2SG-go Mbarara
  'I'm going to Mbarara.'

 B: *n-ze*   *Mbarara*
   1SG-go.s Mbarara
  'Am I going to Mbarara?'

One more strategy that does not fit into the system given in Table 3 is the usage of an exclamatory expression with a meaning 'truly'. This strategy is used in Koromfé to form a full yes-no echo question based on a yes-no and a content question.

(62) KOROMFÉ (< ATLANTIC-CONGO) [Rennison 1997: 32]
 A: *nde*   *n*   *jako*
   where   2SG   walk.DUR
  'Where are you going?'

 B: **handa**   *nde*   *mə*   *jako*
   truly   where   1SG walk.DUR
  'Where am I going?'

7. Conclusion

In this paper I reviewed the strategies that are used in 32 languages of my sample to form echo questions of different types. I considered echo questions based on an affirmative sentence, a yes-no question, and a content question. The echo question may be yes-no or content as well as full or partial.

I define the derivation strategy as the set of features by which the echo question differs from the stimulus sentence. Each strategy is a combination of the following parameters: 1) the marking of an M-part that signals quotation (while an R-part, the reported content, can be formally dependent or independent); 2) the marking of an interrogative semantic component; 3) the presence or absence of the pronominal deictic shift. An M-part can be a clause, affix, clitic, particle or remain unexpressed ('defenestrated' M-clause). An interrogative semantic component is usually expressed by intonation, an interrogative affix, clitic, particle, or pronoun.

There are also several strategies that do not fit neatly into this classification. One of them is a 'deletion' strategy where the linguistic material (e.g. an interrogative marker in the stimulus sentence) is removed (Imbabura Quechua, Japanese, and Kashmiri). The second strategy is to replace the finite verb form in the stimulus sentence with a non-finite verb form in the echo question (Nkore-Kiga). The third strategy is to add an exclamatory particle to the stimulus sentence (Koromfé).

Among the languages of my sample, the most frequent strategies of forming yes-no echo questions are those in which the M-part is not expressed and intonation is the only means of expressing interrogative semantics. Full yes-no questions based on a yes-no question is an exception from this tendency. In full and partial echo questions based on an affirmative sentence, the M-part is most commonly also not expressed.

The study can be expanded by comparing syntactical features of echo and non-echo questions. Further research questions can be: i) to examine the difference in derivation of multiple content echo and non-echo questions and the behavior of interrogative pronouns in them; ii) to examine the syntactic restrictions for echo and ordinary questions and whether they are different or not.

ABBREVIATIONS

1, 2, 3 — 1st, 2nd, 3rd person
ART — article
CARD — cardinal pronoun
COMP — subordinating conjunction
COP — copula
DAT — dative
DEF — definite
DUR — durative
EMPH — emphatic marker
ERG — ergative
F — feminine
FUT — future tense
GEN — genitive
HPL — human plural
HORT — hortative
HS — reportative marker
ILL — illative
IMPF — imperfect
IP — immediate past tense
LOG — logophoric pronoun
M — masculine
N — neuter
NMLZ — nominalization

NOM — nominative
NPST — non-past tense
O — object
PASS — passive
PAUC — paucal
PF — perfect
PFX — prefix
PL — plural
POLITE — politeness
PROG — progressive
PRS — present tense
PST — past tense
PTCL — particle
PURP — purpose
Q — question marker
QUOT — quotative
REFL — reflexive
REMPST — remote past tense
S — subject
SG — singular
STAT — stative
TOP — topic

REFERENCES

Asher 1989 — Asher R. E. *Tamil.* London: Routledge, 1989.

Asher, Kumari 2013 — Asher R. E., Kumari T. C. *Malayalam.* London: Routledge, 2013.

Banfield 1982 — Banfield A. *Unspeakable sentences*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

Bauer et al. 1993 — Bauer W., Parker W., Evans T. K. *Maori*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Besnier 2002 — Besnier N. *Tuvaluan: A Polynesian language of the Central Pacific.* London: Routledge, 2002.

Bhatia 1993 — Bhatia T. K. *Punjabi.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Borg, Azzopardi-Alexander 2013 — Borg A., Azzopardi-Alexander M. *Maltese*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Chernova 2012 — Chernova E. Echo questions and *wh*-movement: A case of Russian. *Proceedings of Con-SOLE XX*, 2012: 71–86.

Chomsky 1977 — Chomsky N. On *wh*-movement. *Formal syntax*. Culicover P., Wasow T., Akmajian A. (eds.). New York: Academic Press, 1977, 71–132.

Cole 1982 — Cole P. *Imbabura Quechua*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1982.

Comrie, Smith 1977 — Comrie B., Smith N. Lingua descriptive studies: Questionnaire. *Lingua*, 1977, 42(1): 1–72.

Davies 1981 — Davies J. *Kobon*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1981.

Derbyshire 1979 — Derbyshire D. C. *Hixkaryana*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Du Feu 1996 — Du Feu V. *Rapanui.* London; New York: Routledge, 1996.

Everett, Kern 1997 — Everett D., Kern B. *Wari'.* London: Routledge, 1977.

Faraclas 1996 — Faraclas N. G. *Nigerian Pidgin*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Fortescue 1984 — Fortescue M. D. *West Greenlandic.* London: Croom Helm, 1984.

Ganenkov 2010 — Ganenkov D. Reported speech in Dargwa: An overview. Paper presented at the *Workshop on Reported speech in East Caucasian languages Lyon, 22 September 2010*.

Gary, Gamal-Eldin 1982 — Gary J. O., Gamal-Eldin S. *Cairene Egyptian colloquial Arabic.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1982.

Ginzburg, Sag 2000 — Ginzburg J., Sag I. *Interrogative investigations: The form, meaning, and use of English interrogatives*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 2000.

Güldemann 2008 — Güldemann T. *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2010.

Hewitt 1979 — Hewitt B. G. *Abkhaz*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1979.

Hinds 1986 — Hinds J. *Japanese*. London; New York: Routledge, 1986.

Holes 1990 — Holes C. *Gulf Arabic.* London: Routledge, 1990.

Hualde 1992 — Hualde J. I. *Catalan*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Huddleston 1994 — Huddleston R. The contrast between interrogatives and questions. *Journal of Linguistics*, 1994, 30(2): 411–439.

Huttar, Huttar 1994 — Huttar G. L., Huttar M. L. *Ndyuka.* London: Routledge, 1994.

Jang, Caponigro 2022 — Jang S., Caponigro I. A semantic analysis for Korean echo questions. *Japanese / Korean Linguistics*, 2022, 29: 165–179.

Joseph, Philippaki-Warburton 1987 — Joseph B. D., Philippaki-Warburton I. *Modern Greek.* London: Croom Helm, 1987.

Karttunen 1997 — Karttunen L. Syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics and philosophy*, 1997, 1: 3–44.

Kato 2019 — Kato M. A. Echo questions in Brazilian Portuguese. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada*, 2019, 35(1): 1–16.

Kenesei et al. 1998 — Kenesei I., Vago R. M., Fenyvesi A. *Hungarian*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Kornfilt 1997 — Kornfilt J. *Turkish*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Mallinson 1986 — Mallinson G. *Rumanian.* London: Routledge, 1986.

Mahootian, Gebhardt 1997 — Mahootian S., Gebhardt L. *Persian.* London: Routledge, 1997.

McCawley 1998 — McCawley J. D. *The syntactic phenomena of English.* Vol. 2. Chicago; London: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1998.

McGregor 1994 — McGregor W. B. The grammar of reported speech and thought in Gooniyandi. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 1994, 14(1): 63–92.

Merlan 1989 — Francesca C. *Mangarayi*. London; New York: Routledge, 1989.

Mycock 2019 — Mycock L. Analysing 'wh' echo questions: A typological perspective with special reference to Hungarian. *Argumentum*, 2019, 15(60): 575–590.

Nedjalkov 1997 — Nedjalkov I. *Evenki*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Nikitina 2012 — Nikitina T. Logophoric discourse and first person reporting in Wan (West Africa). *Anthropological Linguistics*, 2012, 54(3): 280–301.

Noh 1995 — Noh E.-J. A pragmatic approach to echo questions. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 1995, 7: 107–140.

Pandharipande 1997 — Pandharipande R. V. *Marathi*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Rennison 1997 — Rennison J. R. *Koromfe*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Roberts 1987 — Roberts J. *Amele*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.

Schaub 1985 — Schaub W. *Babungo*. London: Routledge, 1985.

Sobin 1990 — Sobin N. On the syntax of English echo questions. *Lingua*, 1990, 81(2–3): 141–167.

Sobin 2010 — Sobin N. Echo questions in the minimalist program. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 2010, 41(1): 131–148.

Sohn 2020 — Sohn H. *Korean*. London: Routledge, 2020.

Spronck 2017 — Spronck S. Defenestration: Deconstructing the frame-in relation in Ungarinyin. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2017, 114: 104–133.

Spronck, Nikitina 2019 — Spronck S., Nikitina T. Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain. *Linguistic Typology*, 2019, 23(1): 119–159.

Sridhar 1990 — Sridhar S. N. *Kannada*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Sudo 2010 — Sudo Y. *Metalinguistic semantics for echo questions*. Cambridge (MA): Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010.

Sulkala, Karjalainen 1992 — Sulkala H., Karjalainen M. *Finnish*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Taylor 1985 — Taylor C. *Nkore-Kiga*. London: Croom Helm, 1985.

Wali, Koul 1997 — Wali K., Koul O. N. *Kashmiri*. London: Routledge, 1997.