Chapter-V

MINOR INTERROGATIVE FORMS

a. Echo Questions
b. Tag Questions.
c. Rhetorical Questions.
d. Alternative Questions
e. Indirect Questions.

The focus of the fifth chapter is concentrated on the construction of the 'Minor Interrogative Forms'. These forms basically include 'Echo questions', 'Tag questions', 'Rhetorical questions', 'Alternative questions' and 'Indirect questions. The Echo questions in English have been considered so deviant from normal questions as to be excluded from the syntactic description of the latter. The first part of this chapter proposes an analysis of English and Kannada Echo-questions.

A. ECHO QUESTIONS

An attempt is made here to bring the Echo-questions into the realm of normal question syntax. Let us consider the following example:
1. a Mary is still helping John.
   
b Mary is still helping who \textdagger?

The given quote is characteristic of the usual treatment of EQs: '....The relative unrestrictedness of Echo-questions makes it unprofitable to attempt to integrate them into the analysis of the more usual type of questions....' (Culicover 1976:73)

The Echo-Question formation is a discourse strategy i.e., strategy necessarily involving more than one sentence in the some of 'normal' language use context such as a conversion

2. Some basic features of Echo-Questions

There are two types of Echo-Questions in English, 'syntactic' Echo-Questions and 'pseudo' Echo-Questions. As an initial illustration of each type, consider (2):

(2a) U: Bill married Beena

(2b) E: Bill married who †?

(2c) E: Who did Bill marry †?

We discuss precisely that the discourse context of an Echo-Question is critical to explaining its syntax. Hence, we will use the abbreviations U to indicate an utterance and E or *E to indicate an acceptable or unacceptable Echo-Question response to that utterance. Utterance (2a) may be echoed in two ways as shown here.
Echo-Question (2b) illustrates a syntactic Echo-Question response, a structure which is in certain critical respects a copy of U. In such Echo-Questions, any newly introduced wh-phrases appear in predicate. Another possible Echo-Question to (2a) is (2c), a pseudo Echo-Question, an apparently normally constructed question to which (2a) would be an answer.

We will discuss pseudo and then syntactic Echo-Questions in more detail. Preliminary to this discussion are some brief remarks on intonation and on the +/- WH phrases in Echo-Questions.

2.1 Brief remarks on intonation

Common to Echo-Questions of both types is a final upward intonation, as the final upward arrow indicates in (1b) above and in (2b-c), repeated below:

(2a) U: Bill married Beena
(2b) E: Bill married who ↑?
(2c) E: Who did Bill marry ↑?

An Echo-Question with simple downward final intonation is unacceptable, as (2d-e) shows.

(2d) *E: Bill married who ↓?
(2e) *E: Who did Bill marry ↓?

There are E's with apparent final downward intonation, in response to a U which has upward intonation, as in (3). However, as
In (3b), this downward intonation is preceded by a strong upward intonation; further, these EQ's always seem to have an optional additional final upward intonation, for which a final downward intonation as in (3b) may be considered a sort of contraction.

(3a) U: Does Mary still help John?

(3b) E: Does Mary still help John↑?

Though much more could, and probably should, be said about intonation, we will leave it, claiming that an Echo-Question must have final upward intonation, which we will call 'surprise' intonation.

**An analysis of Echo-Questions**

This section explains the analysis of Echo-Questions into two types pseudo and syntactic. Recognizing this distinction is critical to deriving Echo-Questions by a normal rather than by an abnormal syntax of English questions, even in the light of difficulties such as the apparent superiority violations as in (7b):

(4a) U: I wonder what Mary brought.

(4b) E: You wonder what who brought?

The details of pseudo Echo-Questions are spelled out first in order to clear the way for discussion of the construction of syntactic Echo-Questions.
3.1. **Pseudo Echo-Questions**

In more detail, one may think of the construction of pseudo Echo-Questions as follows: "upon encountering a 'questionable' statement, the speaker may create a syntactically 'normal' question to which the questionable statement would be a syntactically normal declarative response. The declarative character of U is crucial." Thus, (5a) may be echo-questioned as in (5b):

\[(5a) \quad U: \text{Jack helps Mary.} \]

\[(5b) \quad E: \text{Who does Jack help?} \]

However, (6b) is not an acceptable Echo-Question to (6a), since (6a) is not declarative:

\[(6a) \quad U: \text{Does Jack help Mary?} \]

\[(6b) \quad *E: \text{Who does Jack help?} \]

In using the phrase 'syntactically normal question', we do not include syntactic Echo-Questions, such as (7c):

\[(7c) \quad E: \text{Jack helps who?} \]

Such syntactic Echo-Questions are the topic of the following subsection.

### 3.2 Syntactic Echo-Questions

We have labeled Echo-Questions such as (8c) 'syntactic' Echo-Questions because of their apparently distinct syntax involving
unmoved wh-phrases. Both pseudo Echo-Questions and Syntactic Echo-Questions are strongly linked to the discourses in which they occur. We propose here that the formation of syntactic Echo-Questions involves the following elements:

(i) surprise intonation;
(ii) an exact copy of the LF-structure is echoed
(iii) unselective binding in LF of Echo-Question-Introduced wh-phrases (Pesetsky:1987);
(iv) a 'copy', possibly loose, wh-elements of the utterance being echoed.

Element (i) will not be dealt with further here. Since wh-movement is to COMP, element, (ii) is a freezing of the COMP-Wh-movement dimension of a syntactic derivation. Element (iii) is the mechanism which in part explains why certain Echo-Questions which appear to violate the Superiority condition, for example, are possible. Element (iii) also helps to explain which wh-phrases in such Echo-Questions are intended to elicit a response and which are not. Elements (ii) and (iii) deal with 'frozen' parts of Echo-Question structure. In other respects an Echo-Question may be a less exact copy of the utterance being questioned, including, for example, inexact copying of sentence elements related to NP-movement. However, a complete investigation of this fourth element is beyond the scope of the present work.
The following subsection will explore further each of these elements of Echo-Question formation, exception element (1).

### 3.2.1 Intonation Pattern of Echo-Questions

I will illustrate this first by considering three utterances of differing phrasal structure, and acceptable and unacceptable Echo-Question responses to them. The three utterances are given below as items (10a-c). The Echo-Question responses are given in (8). Following each Echo-Question in (8) is a set of three markings, indicating the (un) acceptability of that Echo-Question as a response to each of the utterances.

(10a) U: Farida likes chocolate.

(10b) U: Does Farida like chocolate?

(10c) U: Who likes chocolate?

The following are the representations of intonation patterns of Echo Questions raised in example (10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarative. Yes-No Q. Wh-Q.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11) Echo-questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frieda likes chocolate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Frieda likes what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Does Frieda like chocolate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Does Frieda like what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Does who like chocolate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(10a)</th>
<th>(10b)</th>
<th>(10c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>*E</td>
<td>*E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>*E</td>
<td>*E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>*E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>*E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>*E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utterance (10a) is a declarative sentence whose COMP structure is simply -WH. As a declarative, it may serve as the declarative answer to a question, and thus pseudo Echo-Questions are possible with (10a). The pseudo Echo-Questions to (10a) are (11c), (g), (h), and (i). The COMP-frozen syntactic Echo-Questions to (10a) are (11a) and (b), which have -wh Phrases. In non-echo questions in English, if one or more wh-phrases are present, a wh-phrase must move to clausal boundary. Thus, (11d-f) are not pseudo Echo-Questions but they are normal questions. Question (11j) is also not a possible pseudo Echo-Question to (10a), since it is a Superiority violation. 4

Utterance (10b) is a yes-no question whose phrasal structure is +Wh, with no additional wh-phrases. Since it is not declarative, it is not a possible declarative response to a normal question; consequently, it admits no pseudo Echo-Question responses. The only acceptable Echo-Question responses to (10b) will be syntactic E-Questions with an identical +Wh phrasal structure, one which is vacant of any wh-phrases. Thus, the only Echo-Question responses to (10b) are the syntactic Echo-Questions (11c-f).
Utterance (10c) is a wh-question. Its phrase structure is +Wh, but it also contains a wh-phrase, the subject ‘who’. The same considerations which bar pseudo Echo-Questions as responses to (10b) also bar them here. Thus, the only Echo-Question responses to (10c) are the syntactic Echo-Questions (11h) and (i), each of which contains a phrasal structure identical to (10c) in regard to the +/-Wh character of phrase and wh-phrases present in its structure.

**Echo-Questions in Kannada**

The Echo questions in Kannada proposes a normal syntax. A yes-no question asked for clarification of what the previous speaker said usually takes the form of the repetition of one or more elements of the statement, with the yes-no questions clitic - ‘aa’ attached to the right of the last element as given under.

1. sandeepanannu aaspatrege haakiddare.
   They have admitted sandeep to hospital.

2.a. aaspatregaa ?
   To the hospital ?.

or

b. aaspatrege haakiddaraa ?
   Admitted to the hospital ?
   The verbal element by itself may also be repeated:

c. haakiddaraa ?
   Admitted ?
d. raamə banda.
   Ramu came

e. bandanaa ḳ?
   Did he come ḳ?

Question-word Echo-questions minimally consists of the question word and the verb; other constituents may optimally be repeated, though usually they are not.

3. a. appaa maveenahaNNuNdannu tandiddaare.
   Father has brought the mangoes

   b. eenu tandiddaare ḳ?
   What has he brought ḳ?

Yes-no questions are echoed either by asking the previous speaker whether he asked that question or by repeating just the constituent under focus, with yes-no question clitic attached to it.

4. a. maLe baruttaa ḳ?
   Will it rain ḳ?

   b. 'maLe baruttaa ḳ' andiraa?
   Did you say will it rain ḳ?
   or

c. maLenaa ḳ?
   Rain ḳ?
Potentially all elements in the sentence, including the verb, and any combination of elements are subject to echo questioning.

5. a. mallappana angaDige yaaru yaavaaga eeke hoogiddaru ?
   Who went when and why to Mallappa’s shop ?

   b. yaara angaDige yaaru yaavaaga eeke hoogiddaru ?
   Who went when and why to whose shop ?

Thus, the echo questions share few properties in both the languages. The syntactic structure and intonation varies in these two languages. The declarative sentences are echoed on the final position. The yes-no EQs and Wh-EQs are echoed in both the languages share common properties. The following are the examples:

1. AruNanige caakaleetu seeuttade. (Declarative sentence)
   Arun likes chocolate.

2. raama citrakaleyannu iSTapaDuttaaneyee? (Yes-No Q)
   Does Rama like painting ?

3. yaaru pustakagaLannu tandaru ? (Wh-Question)
   Who brought the books ?

Thus, the declarative sentences, Yes-no EQs and Wh-EQs share a few similarities at syntactic level and yet they differ at semantic level.
B. TAG QUESTIONS IN ENGLISH AND KANNADA

There are two major categories of "tag questions" in English. The first and a more widely studied type of tag, here called a "reversal tag", a declarative sentence or the host sentence is followed by tag consisting of tensed auxiliary is negative if the host sentence is affirmative and affirmative if the host sentence is negative, and the pronoun corresponding to the subject of the host sentence.

1. a. Savita has washed the dishes, hasn't she?
   b. Nita has not brought the books, has she?
   c. Radhika has not bought the clothes, has she?
   d. Naveen will be at the party, won't he?
   e. You and I were not nominated to academy, were we?
   f. There's a post office around the corner, isn't there?

Tags, like yes-no or wh-interrogative, involve in the inversion of the auxiliary. If the declarative has a be, have or modal it is repeated in the tag. If not, we use do. The subject of the declarative is repeated in the tag and it is repeated by a pronoun. If the declarative is negative, the tag is positive, if is positive, the tag is negative as it is mentioned above with example. Usually Indian learners violate these rules and use "isn't it?" as a tag for all declarative sentences. Let us see the following examples:

   g. Raju has gone, isn't it?
   h. You aren't coming, isn't it?
These are ungrammatical sentences. We shall study the formal details of the derivation of tags. We should point out these tags. Like wh-interrogatives are derived through yes–no interrogatives. A few sample derivations are given below.

1. Raju has gone.

Interrogative: Has Raju gone?

Negative : Hasn't Raju gone?
(The negative participle ‘n’t’ is attached)

Pron : Hasn't he gone?
(The subject is pronominalized)

Pred. phrase del: Hasn't he?
(The constituents after the subject are deleted)

Here we notice that 'hasn't he?' is attached to the statement 'Raju has gone.' Thus, the sentence in the tag will be:

Raju has gone, hasn't he?

j. He went there yesterday.

Interro : Did he go there yesterday.

Neg : Didn't he go there yesterday.
(The subject is already a pronoun)

Pred. phrase del: Didn't he?

Tag : He went there yesterday, didn't he?
k. You are not coming.
   Interro : Aren't you coming.
   Neg del : Are you coming.
   (The 'n't' is deleted)
   Pred. phrase del: Are you?
   Tag : You are not coming, are you?

   The formal derivation of tags is discussed above. The second category is called a reduplicative tag. In this type a tag without negation is added to the declarative sentence.1

   2.a. So Savita has washed the dishes, has she? Well I know for a fact that she hasn't.
   b. Ramya: This coin is worth Rs.1000/-
      Rashmi: It is worth Rs.1000, is it? Well, then, you would better keep it in the safe place.
   c. Vani can play violin, can she? I didn't know that.
   d. Raju isn't arriving until 7:00, is he? Well, That's too bad.

   In the both categories, the Auxiliary verb normally matches that of the host sentence, and if the host sentence has no Auxiliary verb, a "do" with the tense of the host sentence appears in the tag:

   3.a. Savita washed the dishes, didn't she?
       b. Vani play the violin, does she?

   Each of the two types of tags has a variety of uses, correlated in the part with the intonation that is imposed on them. As an overall
nature of their uses, we will accept Cattel’s claim that reversal tags ask for confirmation of a proposition that the speaker puts forward as his own position, while reduplicative tags are attached to sentences that the speaker is not putting forward as his own but is “citing in order to ask the listener if it is his.” Reduplicative tags are sometimes characterized as “belligerent” in view of their frequent use in the samples such as (2a), in which the speaker challenges what his interlocutor has just said. However, Cattell points are that reduplicative tags are also extremely common in examples like (2b-c), in which the speaker’s attitude to his interlocutor is not belligerence but docility—he’s willing to take interlocutor’s word. Either way, the host sentence is presented as “belonging to” the interlocutor a rather than to the speaker. We also notice that if ‘is it’ is replaced by ‘isn’t it’ in (2b), the character of Rashmi’s response changes sharply: Rashmi is no longer taking Ramya’s word for the value of the coin but is setting herself up as an expert and offering own verdict in the corroboration of Ramya’s opinion.

There is third type of tag question that has been analyzed under reversal tags but warrant a separate category of it’s own, namely, apparent reversal tags like (1c), in which the host sentence has a ‘fake’ negation. While (1b) is a straightforward reversal tag, (1c), which differs from (1b) in the rising pitch of the tag and lack of the any rhythmic break between host and tag, rises the possibility that Savita has washed the dishes and asks whether that possibility is the case. The notion that sentences like (1c) have a fake negation is confirmed by
the fact that they can contain 'positive polarity items,' which normally cannot be combined with negation, but not the 'negative polarity items' that a real from negation licenses.\(^2\)

4). a. I'd rather be at home.

   b. I wouldn't rather be at home

   c. You wouldn't rather be at home, would you?

   d. I wouldn't give him a red cent

   e. You wouldn't give him a red cent, would you?

The fourth type of tag questions are taken up here to notice how they are formed with syntactic structures. Tags that are an exact match to the host sentence are the preferred form for tags, and it appears that deviations from that preferred form is unacceptable so far we have discussed the role of negation in tag questions. To evaluate the statement that the choice between 'hasn't he' and 'has he' depends on the affirmative and negative character of the host sentence, it is necessary to clarify what is for a sentence to be affirmative or negative. English in fact has a large number of devices for expressing negation. Only a negation that has the whole host sentence as its scope suffices to force 'has he' rather than 'hasn't he' as the tag:

5. a. Vinay hasn't been paying attention to us, has /'hasn't he?

   b. Vinay has been paying attention to us, hasn't he ?
c. No candidate expects to get majority, ?? does / *doesn’t he ?

d. No candidate is likely to get majority, * is /isn’t he/ it?

In the view of the impossibility of choosing an appropriate tag, no examples with a negative quantifier on the subject NP, as in (5 c,d,) are fully acceptable It is of particular interest that tags with ‘isn’t’ are completely unacceptable in (5 d) ; as evidently the negative form of the subject NP is enough to rule out a negative tag even when the negation has a sub-ordinate sentence as its scope. By contrast, a negative NP within the verb of the host sentence is no obstacle a negative tag :

6. a. Naveen said nothing, didn’t he ?

b. Praveen talked to no one, didn’t he ?

Oehrle (1983) points out that adverbs such as ‘seldom’ and ‘rarely’ that are negative in meaning but not in form can be combined both with the negative and with positive tags though the two forms are not interchangeable ? 3

7. a. John seldom goes out, does he ?

b. John seldom goes out doesn’t he ?

c. John goes out seldom, does he ?

d. John goes out seldom, doesn’t he ?

The two positions of adverb yield at most subtle difference in meaning in (7) though there is much clearer difference in meaning in such examples as (8).
8. a. Dogs seldom have a blue fur.
b. Dogs have a blue fur seldom.
c. Linguists seldom play tennis.
d. Linguists play tennis seldom.

In the interpretations of (8 a,c), 'seldom' refers not to the distribution of events in time but to the distribution of examples in a class. For example, (8 c) says that there are few linguists that play tennis, while in (7 a) an interpretation that say there are few instances of John going out, with 'seldom'; taking the whole sentence as its scope. Thus, the possibilities of the tags correspond to whether the negative word (seldom) has the whole host sentence as its scope.

Earlier in this section, we have noticed that the framing of tag sentences depends on the complement sentence. Robin Lakoff used facts about such sentences as the basis of an argument for a very specific derivation of reversal tag questions. Lackoff noted that besides sentences such as (9 a), in which a negative complement sentence is combined with its normal reversal tag. There is also a sentence (9 b), with approximately the same meaning but the negation in the main sentence.

9. a. I suppose the Indians won't win the match, will they?
b. I don't suppose the Indians will win the match, will they?
c. * I don't suppose the Indians will win the match, won't they?
Lakoff maintains that not only (9 a) but also (9 b) has the meaning of a reversal tag rather than a reduplicative tag, in which case there is problem in accounting for (9 b-c) : if a reversal tag is based on the complement sentence in (9 b), its form should be ‘won't they' not ‘will they' but in fact will they and not ‘won't they' is possible. Lakoff noted that the derivation involves not only whatever rule is applied in forming tags but also 'Negative Raising' which raises a 'not' from the complement of verb such as think, suppose, believe and moves into higher sentence under that suggestion, (9 b) has the same deep structure as (9 a), and as long as the choice of the tag can be restricted to a derivational stage prior to Negative Raising, the tag in (9 b) will be same as in (9 a).

Lakoff in fact proposed that all reversal tag questions have a deep structure of the form 'I suppose', and that 'Tag formation' attaches to a tag to the complement of 'suppose' with present tense and first person singular subject, Lackoff's analysis handles the fact that in sentences like (10) the tag would have to be formed on a stage subsequent to Negative Raising:

10. Harsha didn't suppose that the Indians would win the match, did/* didn't he ?

Lakoff's proposal yields correct predictions about their intonations while reversal tags have both a version with falling intonation and one with raising intonation, reduplicative tags allow only rising intonation :
11. a. The Indians haven't won the match, \ have they ?
   b. The Indians haven't won the match, / have they ?
   c. * The Indians have won the match, \have they ?
   d. The Indians have won the match, / have they ?

   But we also come across that the examples like (9 b) carry falling as well as rising intonation:

12. a. I don't suppose the Indians have won, \ have they ?
   b. I don't suppose the Indians have won, / have they ?

   the further, confirmation of proposition that the tag of (9 b) is a reversal tag and not reduplicative is provided by example such as (13 a) in which the apparent surface complement does not as an independent sentence allow a reduplicative tag:

13. a. I don't suppose you by any chance have a job, do you ?
   b. * you by any/some chance have a job, do you ?

   Thus, tag questions in English are highlighted under minor question forms. They need an independent study which would provide new dimensions in the field.
TAGS QUESTIONS IN KANNADA

The second part in this section explores the study of tag questions in Kannada. The tag questions are formed by adding suffixes of questions - 'ee' expecting an answer in the affirmative; the first two insert a euphonic - 'v' the last one adds - 'ee' immediately to - alla. In this construction, the head noun phrase is followed by the confirmatory tag -alla “isn't it ?” and the pronoun corresponding to the head NP. The clause, the tag, and the pronoun form an internal unit marked by a strong comma intonation, with the pitch rising on the tag and falling on the pronoun. Let us consider the following examples.

1. a. rajani daNididdaLe allave ?
   Rajani tired isn't it.
   b. Rajani is tired, isn't it so ?
   c. Rajani is tired, isn't she ?

2. a. avaru nimmallige bandiralilla allave ?
   they to you come not,isn't it .'
   b. They did not come to you, isn't it ?
   c. They did not come to you, did they ?

3. a. avanu maatra nimmallige bandidd, allave ?
   he only to you came isn't it ?
   b. Only he came to you, isn't it ?
   c. Only he came to you, didn't he ?
4. a. adu gubbi allave?
   It sparrow isn't it?

   b. It is a sparrow, isn't it?

5. a. ninnadu adee haadi, alave?
   yours the same road isn't it so?

   b. Yours is the same road, isn't it so?

   c. Yours is the same road, isn't it?

The second type of tags questions in Kannada that we construct
by adding clitic- 'oo' to 'alla' and the answer is being affirmative as given
under 4:

6. a. Vyoma cennaagillavoo?
   Vyoma a well behaved person or not

   b. Vyoma is a well behaved person, isn't it /or not?

   c. Vyoma is a well behaved person, isn't he?

7. a. naavu maraNaadheenarallavoo?
   we mortals or not?

   b. We are mortals, isn't it /or not?

   c. We are mortals, aren't we?

8. a. yuvakarige kelasavillavoo?
   youths work not
b. youths have no work, isn't is / or not ?
c. youths have no work, have they ?

In all the examples given above the sentences (b) is an ungrammetical and not accepted in English whereas as sentences (c) are grammatically correct and accepted in English language.

The tags in Kannada have typical constructions. The tags are also formed by being an euphonic word- 'allave' anywhere in the sentence which is non-acceptable in English and possible only in Kannada.

9. a. naalku gantegallave il railu biDuvudu ?
   Four 'o' clock not this van leave
b. This train leaves at four 'o' clock, isn't it / or not ?
C. This train leaves at four o' clock, isn't it / or it ?

10.a. niivallavee ninne inglishanalli bhaSanNa
   maaDiddu ?
   you, not yesterday in English speech deliver.
b. You delived a speech in English yesterday, isn't it
c. You delivered a speech in English yesterday, didn't you ?

11. a. nivu ninnee kannadaDadallallavee
    bhaSaNa maaDiddu ?
    you yesterday in kannada not speech deliver.
b. You delivered speech in kannada, isn't it so ?
c. You delivered speech in kannada, didn't you ?
The tag formation in Kannada is also possible by adding suffix - 'taane' instead of 'allave'. These questions are more definite information seeking one rather than the earlier tag questions.

The suffix- 'taane' is an empty word used at the end of the sentence as a confirmatory device.

12. a. niivu uurige baruvadilla taane ?
   you to village come-not are you ?
   b. You will not come to village, are you ?
   c. You will not come to village, won't you ?

13. a. naavu hoogooNa taane ?
   we shall go are you ?
   b. we shall go, are you ?
   c. we shall go, shan't we ?

The emphatic particle - 'taane' should be used for emphasis anywhere in a sentence in relation to the words that they stand for. This empty word 'taane' is equivalent to 'Do' in English. But the use of - 'taane' with other words in a sentence by stating the meaning "only" is used in the following examples :

14. a. avanu taane naaLe hoogooNavendaddu ?
       He only tomorrow shall go - said
   b. He only said we shall go tomorrow, is he ?
   c. He only said we shall go tomorrow, didn't he ?
15. a. niinu allige taane hoogoonavendaddu?
   you there only shall go said

   b. You said we shall go there only, is there?
   c. You said we shall go there only, didn't you?

16. a. ibbaru taane bandaddu?
   two only come?

   b. Both of you only came, are you?
   c. Both of you only came, didn't you?

17. a. ii kaadambariyannu taane niivu odiddu?
   This novel only you read

   b. This is the only novel you read, is it?
   c. This is the only novel you read isn't it?

18. a. avaLa joteylli taane hoodaddu?
   her with only went

   b. You went only with her, are you?
   c. You went only with her, didn't you?

19. a. ii tingaLalli mooru divasa raje taane?

   b. There are only three holidays in this month, is it?
   c. There are only three holidays in this month, aren't there?
Thus, the word order in Kannada does allow the emphatic particle 'taane' and 'allave' with all words in a sentence. But there is a lack of reversal or reduplicative tag formation in Kannada as it is found in English. The construction of tag questions in both languages are variant in the syntactic environment. Tag formation in Kannada do not take inversion and substitution of the pronominal subjects. Hence they lack syntactic properties eventhough they share semantic elements.
RHETORICAL QUESTIONS:

A rhetorical question is considered to be a stylistic device. It is a slightly indirect way of saying things. There are two types of rhetorical questions—positive and negative. A rhetorical question is a forceful statement or assertion. It may be used with laudatory or derogatory intention. For example, one person may say to another person, who is boastful, something like:

a. Who can find fault with you?

Obviously the speaker is trying to be sarcastic. A laudatory use of rhetorical question is found in instances like the following:

b. Who does not know Mahatma Gandhi?

A third use of rhetorical question can be for setting the mood or perceptive in an oral or written narration. There is a beautiful narration of Alexander Puskin in his book 'The Station Master' which begins in the following manner:

d. "Who has not cursed the superintendents of posting stations? Who has not quarrelled with them? Who in a moment of anger has not demanded from them the fatal book to write in it his useless complain of injustice, rudeness and inefficiency? Who does not regard them as human monsters, as bad as the attorneys of the old days or at any rate as the Murom highwaymen?"
NPIs in Rhetorical Questions.

Negative Polarity Items (henceforth, NPIs) are known to be licensed in wh-questions. However, it may be pointed out that there are interpersonal and grammatically differences in wh-questions with NPIs in different syntactic environments. In some cases, a wh-question or ambiguous between true information seeking wh-question and rhetorical question and in other cases it has only the 'Rhetorical question' formation. Progovac (1993) used the term 'rhetorical question to refer to wh-constructions which do not have the semantics of questions, but rather are negative assertions'.

The questions in (1) are ambiguous between the true wh-question and a rhetorical question.

1. a. Who has ever been to Rose garden?
   b. Who said anything at seminar?

   For instance, the question in (1a) can be in interpreted as asking for information about visitors to Rose garden or it could be interpreted as assertive of the speaker's belief that no one has ever been to Rose garden.

   The questions in (2) are not ambiguous. They are grammatical only with a rhetorical question formation.

2. a. Who has Sham ever agreed with?
   b. What did anybody say at the syntax seminar?
The C-command requirement captures the facts in double object wh-questions with NPIs following Larson (1988) the direct object C-Commands the indirect object. When the wh-question has a trace in the direct object position and on NPI question formation and rhetorical question formation is available. However, when the wh-question has an NPI in the direct object position and trace in the indirect object position, only the rhetorical question forming should be available. The predication is born out as shown in (4).

4. a. Who did Amita introduce to anyone at the party?
   
b. Who did Amita introduce anyone to at the party?

The question in (4a) can be interpreted as asking for information about people Amita introduced to someone (wh-question formation) or it could be interpreted as an assertive about the speaker's belief that Somebody did not make any introductions at the party (rhetorical question formation). The question in (4b) can only be interpreted with the rhetorical question formation.

NPI - Lincensing on the Rhetorical Questions

We recall that wh-questions that are interpreted as Rhetorical questions lack the semantics of true wh-question. Rather, they are interpreted as negative assertions.

5. a. Who has Shama ever agreed with?
   
b. What has Rama ever done right?
The rhetorical question in (5a) asserts that Shama has agreed with no one and the rhetorical question in (5b) asserts that Rama has done nothing right.

Unlike wh-question, Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) in rhetorical by the trace of a wh - Phrase in order to be licensed. We propose that the licensing condition of NPIs in rhetorical wh-question can be explained if the rhetorical wh-question has a syntax and semantics of neg-inversion construction, rather than those of wh-questions.

Rhetorical wh-questions do not have the same syntax as regular wh-questions. Although rhetorical questions at first appear to have the syntax of wh-questions.

6. a. Who does Basu think has ever said anything at the seminar?
   
b. Who did Vasu say has ever read 'Half a life' ?

When the wh-phrase has moved across a clause boundary in Wh-question and Rhetorical question, the sentences are ungrammatical because neither formation of questions is available.

7. a.* Who does Mohan think anyone has ever helped ?
   
b.* Which book does Mohini think that anyone has read ?

I attempt to analyse that the unavailability of the Rhetorical question formation in (6) and (7) has to do with the fact that the NPIs
‘ever’ and ‘anyone’ are separated from the wh-word by a clausal boundary. However, this can not be a correct approach, as shown in (8).

8. a. Who said that Mohini ever liked Mohan?
   b. Who believes that Rohan has ever liked anyone?

Although the NPI and wh-word are separated by a clausal boundary in the sentences in (8), these sentences are both grammatical and interpretable as rhetorical question. The only difference between the data in (6) and (7) and the data in (8) is that in the former case the wh-word moves across a clausal boundary, whereas no wh-movement occurs across the clausal boundary in the latter case. There is no way to account for the grammatically and the interpretational difference between (6), (7) and (8) if we consider that rhetorical wh-questions share the syntax of wh-movement.

Here, we state that rhetorical wh-questions have the syntax and ruminations of neg-inversion constructions. NPIs are licensed because the wh-word is in the medial position.

**Negative Inversion**

Syntactically, neg-inversion refers to the phenomenon in which a negative quantified phrase (Q.P) moves to the prepositional position, accompanied by verb movement.

9. a. With no employee would Mohan be happy.
   b. With no job will Mohan be satisfied.
The examples in (9) have syntactic properties of the neg-inversion. Moreover the negative in each sentence has sentential scope. The example in (9) are interpreted as Mohan would not be happy with any employee, and Mohan will not be satisfied by any job respectively.

Although, neg-inversion looks very much like wh-movement in that both involve phrasal movement in that both accompanied by verb movement, it is different from wh-movement in that it is clause bounded.

10. a. With no job did Mohini say that Mohan will be satisfied.

Rhetorical wh-question formation is similar to neg-inversion. Let see confirm by following examples:

11. a. With what employee would Mohan ever be happy?

b. With what job will Mohan ever be satisfied?

The interpretation of rhetorical questions also corresponds to the interpretation of sentences with negative inversions. That is the wh-phrase rhetorical wh-questions functions as a negative inversion that has sentential scope. Hence, (11a) means Mohan would not be happy with any employees and (11b) means Mohan will not be satisfied with any jobs. The rhetorical questions in (11a) and (11b) means the same thing as the neg-inversion sentences in (9a) and (9b) respectively.

Moreover, rhetorical wh-questions are clause - bounded, just, like negative-inversion.
12 a. *With what employee did Mohini say that Mohan would be ever happy?

b* With what job did Mohini believe that Mohan will be satisfied?

If the proposal that the syntax and the semantics of rhetorical wh-questions be assimilated to neg-inversion and not to wh-movement is correct, the fact that NPIs are licensed to in all wh-rhetorical questions is the wh-word which is semantically equivalent to a negative inversion. Thus, the licenser of the NPI is in the highest clausal position.

**RHETORICAL QUESTIONS IN KANNADA**

Kannada too has rhetorical questions to perform the functions that English rhetorical questions perform. Here are couple of examples.

e i. mahaatmaa gaandhijigavaru yaarige Gottilla?

ii. Mahatma Gandhi who know does not.

iii. Who does not know Mahatma Gandhi?

f i. avana jaaNmeyannu yaaru avahanisuttare?

ii. His wisdom who challenge can.

iii. Who can challenge his wisdom?

The declarative counter parts of these two rhetorical questions will be as follows:
g i. Mahaatma gaandhiji sarvariguu gotliddare.
ii. Mahatma Gandhi everyone knows.
iii. Every one knows Mahatma Gandhi.

h i. avana JaaNmeyannu yaaru avhan maaDuvadilla.
ii. His wisdom nobody challenge will.
iii. Nobody will challege his wisdom.

The use of rhetorical question can be setting the mood or perceptive in an oral or written narration. Kannada has rhetorical questions with wh-words do perform the functions of English rhetorical questions. The following are the few examples:

3. a. avana JaaNmeyannu yaaru avhanisuttare?
   His wisdom who challenge
   b. Who can challenge his wisdom?

4. avana JaaNmeyannu yaaru avhana maaDuvadilla
   his wisdom nobody challenge will
   b. Nobody will challenge his wisdom.

Here, we notice that NPIs are also applicable in the formation of Rhetorical Questions. The negative polarity words like 'yaaru' - "nobody" and "anybody" do correspond at the clausal boundary in Kannada Rhetorical questions also. The corresponding answer to the 4(b) suffices the same meaning. We notice that the Rhetorical questions in Kannada have also Positive Polarity Items (PPIs), which is shown in the following example:
5. a. kaǎLidaasanu sarvarigu u gottiddane
   Kalidas everyone knows

b. Everyone knows Kalidas.

The fact that this sentence licenses to PPIs to frame wh-words corresponding to the formations wh-questions which are Rhetorical questions in their nature. The leading question may be: 'Who doesn't know Kalidas? The answer corresponds to the PPIs expressing: 'sarvarigu' or 'eellarigu' - 'every one.'

6.a. "Kaage ondauguLa kaNDare kareyade tanna baLagavanu?"³
   crow piece of food see call its members

   Seeing a piece of food doesn't the crow call its members after?

   The above given example (6) is a declarative counter part of Rhetorical question. We notice here also that the licensing of the NPIs correspond to the formation of yes-no questions that lead to Rhetorical question. The objective element which is questioned licenses NPIs by providing negative verb -'kareyade' - 'doesn't it call?' It is interesting to notice that the NPIs in Kannada licenses to the PPIs because the word order in Kannada is not fixed. This can be notice in Kannada Vachana Literature of Twelfth century. There are syntactic deviations in both the languages and yet they differ in their formation. Rhetorical questions look like questions at surface level but the answers to these questions are hidden in the same statements. Rhetorical questions are not asked to elicit the information but they are intended to cannote the serious conceptual thoughts. This is what makes the NPIs licensing
to the PPIs are semantically deep rooted as the answers are in the questions themselves. Let us consider the following lines from Akkamahadevi, the great Vachana poetess of Kannada:

a. beTTada meelondu maneya maaDi mrugagaLige anjidoDe enthayya ?
   Having made home at the forest can anyone be afraid of wilde animals?

b. santeyoLagondu maneya maaDi shabdhakke anjidoDe enthayya?
   Having made home at the market can anyone be ashamed of the noise?

Therefore, we may state that the PPIs license to the formation of negative answers and NPIs license to the leading answers in positive orientation. Thus, there are similarities in the formation of Rhetorical questions in both the languages.

D. ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS

The term alternative question is commonly applied to questions of all the following forms:

1. a. Did Sudha arrive on the 1:00 plane or Is she coming on the 3:00 plane?

b. Did Sudha arrive on the 1:00 plane or on the 3:00 plane?

c. Which plane did Sudha arrive on - the 1:00 Plane or 3:00 plane?
The above illustrated (1a-c) questions have in common is that they enumerate a set of possible answers and direct the addressee to choose among them. Ordinarily wh- questions by contrast, are at least open-ended, i.e. which plane did Sudha arrive on ? allows any answer that names the flight.

It is not obvious whether all questions in (1) are in fact instances of a single syntactic construction. Thus, the attempts have made to determine the extent to which the three types of "alternative questions" share syntactic properties. Alternative questions have in fact been neglected by syntacticians. Indeed, virtually all of the discussion of alternative questions to be found in the works of generative grammarians relates to 'whether' another type of question can analysed as a type of alternative question.

Specifically, since Yes-No questions share the characteristic of alternative questions that is mentioned above i.e., Yes-No questions at least enumerate a set of answers and direct the addressee to choose between them, it is natural to entertain the hypothesis that a sentence like (2a) may have the same deep structure as in sentence like (2b)

2) a. Did India win the match ?

b. Did India win the match, or did they not win?

Bolinger (1978) argues that many kinds of yes-no Questions can not be analysed plausibly as reduced alternative questions though his arguments suggest that there are two types of Yes-No question, one which can be treated as an underlying alternative question and one
which can not be. He lists a large number of cases in which a Yes-No question is normal but a corresponding alternative question would be bizarre.

3) A Offers:
   a. Would you like some more coffee or wouldn't you?
   b. Do you like to have chocolate or ice cream.

B. Expression of surprise at an obvious fact.
   a. Are you still here or aren't you?

C. Question for which the act of answering provides the answer
   a. Anjana, are you awake or aren't you?

D. Questions that serve to pass an information to the addressee.
   a. Have you noticed that Hegade and Devegouda have split up or haven't you?

E. Questions that suggest answer to the Wh-question.
   a. What is the matter, are you tired or aren't you?

F. Yes-No questions functioning like wh-questions.
   a. Is today 18th or isn't it?
      (what is the date?)

G. Questions that presuppose there has been no previous discussion.
a. I've just heard he met with an accident are you going or aren't you?

H. Questions asking confirmation of an inference drawn from what has just been said.

a. I can not sleep in the same room with that guy.

b. Does he always snore or doesn't he?

Do you mean he always snores or don't you?

I. Requests.

a. Would you like to contribute to the team or wouldn't you?

J. Question suggesting an absurd possibility.

a. Are you out of your mind or aren't you?

Bolinger notes that the Yes-No questions that resist paraphrase as alternative questions always can be reported in indirect discourse with 'if' but generally not with 'whether':

4. a. He asked if we'd like more coffee.

b. *He asked whether we'd like more coffee.

c. I put my mouth near Anil's ear and asked in a shrill voice if he was awake.

   * I put my mouth near Anil's ear and asked in shrill voice whether he was awake.
e. He asked me if I gave him salt

f. * He asked me whether I gave him salt.

In some of the cases, 'if' and 'whether' are equally acceptable:

5. a. I asked him if / whether he had heard that Hegde and Devegowda had Split up.

b. He asked me if / whether I'd like to contribute to the NAAC committee.

It is found necessary to discuss the use of 'whether' in alternative questions is acceptable or not. such an analysis fits well the account that Bolinger gives of the difference in the meaning between 'whether' and 'if' consider the constructs in the following examples.

6. a. Go see if the paper is here and bring it in

b. Go see whether paper is here and bring it in

c. Go see whether the paper's here and report back.

d. Baby asked if I had a cracker.

e. Baby asked whether I had a cracker

f. He asked me if I would lend him Rs. 1 lakh.

g. He asked me whether I would lend Rs. 1 lakh to a stranger.
The sentences with 'whether' to a determination of which of two alternatives is correct with the answer being relevant to the questioner regardless of whether it is positive or negative. Thus, the contrast between (6b) and (6c): one reports back even if one has determined that the paper is not there, but one brings it in only if it is there. In (16g) we have a report of a request for information, which (6f) could report a request for a loan.

'Whether' can introduce the dependent forms of the alternative questions illustrated (1a-b)

7. a. I wonder whether (*if) the game has been postponed or they are playing it even in the rain)

b. I wonder whether Sudha has taken the 1:00 plane or the 3:00 plane.

A number of Linguists (Katz and Postal) (1995-96) have attempted to relate the 'whether of such sentences to 'either' that could occur corresponding declarative sentences.

8. a. I wonder whether (*either) the game has been postponed or they are playing it even in the rain.

b. (* Either ) has the game been postponed or are they playing it even in the rain?

c. I wonder whether Sudha took (*either) the 1:00 plane or the 3:00 plane.

d. Did Sudha take (*either) the 1:00 plane or the 3:00 plane?
(The *-ed versions of (8a, b,d ) are of course acceptable as non alternative Yes-No, questions e.g (8d) with or without 'either'. could ask whether Sudha took one of the two planes in the question)

We now turn to the neglected third type of alternative question, that in which a WH-expression appears in addition to or - conjoined list of alternatives.

Three characteristics of such question should be noted. (i) The wh-expression can be any possible Wh-expression other than 'whether'.

10. a. When is Sudha arriving - Monday or Tuesday ?

b. Why did Rao resign - because he did not like the job or because he has a better offer ?

c. Whose mother did you talk to Arpita's or Arun's ?

d. Which dictator do more people read books about - Hitler or Stalin ?

e. How did he escape - by digging a tunnel or by climbing over the wall ?

ii. The list of alternatives appear at the end or sometimes immediately after the wh-expression.

11. a. Which dictator - Hitler or Stalin- do more people read books about ?

b. How many cloves of garlic - three or four should she put in the stew ?
c. What colour of soup - red or white - should I serve with dinner?
d. Whose mother - Arpita's or Arun's id you talk to?
e. When - Monday or Tuesday - is Sudha arriving?
f. What day Monday or Tuesday - is Sudha arriving?
g. Why - because of the pay or because of the duties - did Rao resign.

And iii) 'either' may not introduce the list of alternatives.

12. a When is Sudha arriving (*either) Monday or Tuesday?
b. Which of your children do you want to take over the company (*either) Nandan or Nandita?
c. How much water - (*either) one cup or two - should I add to the tea?

ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS IN KANNADA

Alternative questions are formed by adding clitic - 'oo' to the right of each of the constituents expressing an alternative. Optionally, 'athavaa' -'or' or 'illa', -'not' is placed between the last two alternatives. 'illa' can also be placed in front of each of the alternatives, even if there are three or more. 'athavaa' is used only between alternatives. In cleft sentences, the clitic is attached directly to the constituents (e.g., noun phrases, post positional phrases) expressing the alternatives. This kind of questions are called "vaikalpika prashnegaLu" in Kannada. Here, the questioner has no definite idea about situations or facts.
He puts forth this kind of questions to get the right information by giving alternatives. There are 'choices' which enable the speaker to choose the correct word.

1. ravi hoodaddu puNegoo haidaraabaadigoo?
   Did Ravi go to Pune or Hyderabad?

2. rashmi tindaddu maavinahaNNoo baaLehaNNoo?
   Did Rashmi eat a mango or a banana?

3. aake sandarshanakke hoogiruvadu dilligoo, koolkattakkoo athavaa chennaigoo?
   Did she go to interview to Delhi, Calcuta or Chennai?

4. avanu kuNidaddu niirinalloo, nelada meelo athavaa aakaashadallo?
   Did he dance on water, land or sky?

84. rajani bandiruvadu bengaLuurindoo athavaa maisuurindoo?
   Did Rajani come from Bangalore or Mysore?

85. seebu haNNannu tindavaLu sheelaLoo athavaa sheevaleelaLoo?
   The one who ate the apple is Sheela or Shivaleela?

In non equational sentences, the alternatives are always entire clauses, from which the alternative constituent and after the verb are retained and the rest deleted under identity with material in proceeding clauses. The clitics are always attached to the different clausal elements - verbs, objects- may be two objects or adjuncts and complements in each of the alternative clauses. The euponic- "illa" is used as a conjunction "or" to join two clauses - i.e., alternative questions.
5. siite manege hoodaLoo illa kacerige hoodaLoo?
   Did Sita go home or to the office?

6. raaju hoodaddu madraasigoo illa maisuurigoo?
   Did Raju go to Madras or Mysore?

7. rajani tindaddu cakaleeToo illa kekoo?
   Did Rajani eat chocolate or cake?

8. avanee baredanoo illa nakalu maaDidanoo?
   Did he himself write or copy?

   One exception to the preceding statement occurs when the verb and its negation are the alternatives in question: then only the negation with the clitic occurs as the second alternative:

9. niivenu baruttiirroo illavoo ?
   Will you come or not ?

10. avanu baralikkillavaa ?
    Will he come or not ?

   Another exception to the preceding statement takes place when alternative questions conjoin with Yes-No questions:

11. avaLu mumbaige hoogiddaaLaa?
    Had she gone to Bombay?

12. avaLu manayallee kuLittidaaLaa?
    Had she sat at home?

13. avaLu mumbaige hoogiddaaLoo maneyalli kuLittidaaLoo?
    Had she gone to Bombay or sat at home?
Here, questions (11) and (12) are Yes-no questions. But question (13) is formed by conjoining (11) and (12) which is an alternative question. Instead of answering (13) in Yes-no, we have alternatives to choose the right answer. Sometimes we do find some alternative questions which are not inter-related:

14. avaru haldaraabaadige hoogiddaroo, bengaLurige bandiddaaroo?
Have they gone to Hyderabad or come to Bangalore?

15. avaLu nidde maaDuttiddaLoo innoo abhyasa maaDuttiddaLoo?
Is she sleeping or still studying?
Will you cook at home or go to hotel?

16. adu haalannu kuDidideyoo athavaa muleyalli malagikon Dideyoo?
Has it drunk milk or slept in the corner?

17. moohan malagiddaanoo, avanu iinnu kuLitiddaanoo athavaa raatriyella horagaDe tiragutiddanoo?
Is Mohan sleeping or is he sitting or wandering outside all the night?

The main contention of using different alternatives is to choose the right answer from the questions mentioned above from (14) to (17). The questioner can set the perfect answer by putting the alternative questions. In the alternative questions if the verbs are equational they are retained with relation to the subject and the other verb is deleted. The cletics are used with verb as well as nouns

18. avaLu french maatanaaDuttaloo lyaTnu maatanaaDuttaloo?
Does she speak French or Latin?
19. avaLu maatanaaDuvadu frencoo lyatinnoo?
Does she speak French or Latin?

20. avaLu saravannu suratadalli konDukonDaLoo simladalli konDukonDaLoo?
Did she buy the necklace in Surat or Shimla?

21. avaLu saravannu suratadalli konDokondaloo simladalloo?
Did she buy the necklace in Surat or Shimla?

In questions (19) and (20) the verbs are retained and clitic ‘oo’ is attached. The questions (18) and (21) are formed without retaining the second verb and the clitic is used with objects. Thus the second verb is deleted in Kannada. This kind of statements are rarely used in Kannada Language. These are restricted to certain class of words.

E. INDIRECT QUESTIONS

It has been seen above that the various question forms can be obtained by means of certain transformation, which have been established for the language as a whole from the non-interrogative form “I ask you whether......’ These transformations include the intonations of direct speech. Thus, the direct question as derived from the Indirect. The major properties of direct speech, aside from the intonations, lie in the tense-relation to subject say, asks, requests, etc, and in the pronouns. To see how these properties arise we note here that questions, when embedded into the matrix S, function as NP complement. Such embedded questions are known as Indirect Questions.1
Both wh-questions and yes-no questions may be embedded and made a constituent of the matrix S. Let us first consider embedded wh-questions. Observe the following:

1. I don't know what happened later
2. I can't remember when it happen
3. I didn't realise why they did so

Questions undergo certain structural changes, when they are embedded and transformed into interrogative subordinate clause. The principle changes are those in the tense of the verb, pronominals and the word order. The changes that have place in the above indirect questions (a-c) will become explicit, when we consider the structures underlying ²:

4. S₁ (I don't know S₂ (what did happen latter)S₂)S₁
5. S₁ (I can't remember S₂ (when did happen)S₂)S₁
6. S₁ (I don't realise S₂ (why did they do so) S₂)S₁

Embedded yes-no question are generally introduced by the complementizers if or whether. For example:

7. I asked her whether she would like to stay there.
8. I wanted to ask you if you could lend me that book for a day.

Indirect questions should be distinguished from free or headless relatives such as:
9. We didn't like what they said

10. We didn't like the thing they said

The sentence (9) the free relative, is derived from its underlying structure (10) by replacing the head noun the thing with the wh-word what.

The true interrogative clauses are, in fact, derived from nominalisations. They may function as subject, object, and prepositional object. 3 Let us see the following examples:

11. How to get rid of that policeman was his problem
12. He couldn't remember when exactly he met them.
13. It depends on how we go about the issue.

Furthermore, the indirect questions are subject to infinitivalisation. The following are the instances:

13. I don't know how to do it.
14. He remembered what to do further.

The Kannada indirect questions are usually quoted directly with the quotative morpheme - 'embudu' with the verb of asking

15. naaavu alli eenu maaDuttiddeve embudu ellariguu gottu.

Everybody knows what we are doing there.
However, in Kannada pronominal substitutions and change of agreement feature also may occur as in:

16. ChunaavaNeyalli yaaru gelluttare endu avaru yoochisidaru?

They thought who would wins in the elections.

Finally, the use of a cleft construction with its absence of agreement features renders the sentence ambiguous between the paraphrasing of direct question and the reporting of one as in (5)

17. a) nilvu alli hoodaddu ekee endu keeLide?

you there go past why asked

I asked why you went there.

or

I asked, "why did you go there ?"

b) nilvu eenu maDuttiddiro nanage tiliyadu.

you what doing I know not

I do not know what you are doing.

It is also noticeable again, the pronoun in (17b) may refer to the addressee in the current speech situation or to the addressee of the putative quoted question. Thus, in simple words the indirect speech constitutes indirect questions or reported questions in both the languages.
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ECHO-QUESTIONS

1 Chomsky and Lasnik (1977:487) suggest that an Echo-Question such as 'John saw who?' results when COMP is [+WH]. However, this is the extent of their analysis of Echo-Questions.

2 Sentence (6c) is a grammatical Echo-Question to utterance (i), where the utterance itself has a +WH COMP in root S:
   (i) U: Does Mary believe that Bill dates Greta Garbo?

   More will be said about this below.

3 Pesetsky (1987:122, fn.1) exempts Echo-Questions from his analysis of D-linking and unselecting binding.

4 Originally, superiority violations were analyzed as violations of the Superiority Condition (Chomsky (1977:101)). In later analyses, such structures have been barred as ECP violations due to Move Wh in LF (e.g. Chomsky (1981:232ff.)). Pesetsky (1987:104ff.) analyzes superiority violations as violations of the Nested Dependency Condition again due to Move Wh in LF. I will not go further into these analyses at this point, except to say that under any of these analyses, a superiority violation is diagnostic of a movement in syntax or in LF. This is exploited by Pesetsky and in the account to follow.

TAG-QUESTIONS

1. Examples like (2d), while often slightly odd, are much more normal sounding than correspondingly examples with a negative tag and they are only halfway normal form that a tag on a negative host can take in context that call for reduplicative tag there is no different in surface form between reduplicative and reversal tag.

2. The same sort of fake negation also occur in yes, no questions:
   a. wouldn't you rather be at home?
   b. Hasn't someone already said that?
3. Oehrle marks (6 a : doesn't ) with an ♦, As a reduplicative tag construction (6 b - does ) is acceptable. But (6 b) is ignored here, since only reversal tags are under consideration.

4. Lakoff assimilated this proposal to the hypothesis of Ross but the "superstructure" would no longer of the form that law be deleted and (I don't suppose the Indians would win the match, did he?) would result.

RHETORICAL-QUESTIONS


4. Ibid pp-19-25

INDIRECT-QUESTIONS


2. Ibid : pp - 272

3. Ibid : pp - 273