

Yoshio Endo*

Non-standard questions in English, German, and Japanese

<https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2020-0108>

Received October 28, 2020; accepted November 5, 2020

Abstract: This paper discusses the nature of non-standard questions in English, German, and Japanese. I will first introduce some basic properties of non-standard questions and then show that non-standard questions can be classified into the speaker-oriented type and the addressee-oriented type. It is suggested that the addressee-oriented non-standard questions can be further classified into the counter-expectation type and the aggressive question type.

Keywords: addressee-orientation; aggressive question; counter-expectation; non-standard question; sentence final particle; speaker-orientation

1 Introduction

In this paper, I will discuss the nature of non-standard questions (NSQs) in English, German, and Japanese. I will first introduce some basic properties of NSQs and then show that NSQs can be classified into two types: the speaker-oriented type and the addressee-oriented type. I will then suggest that the addressee-oriented NSQs can be further classified into the counter-expectation type and the aggressive question type. I will finally summarize the whole discussion.

2 Basic properties of NSQs: [+speaker-oriented] and [+addressee-oriented]

In this section, I will introduce some basic properties of NSQs by comparing them with standard questions (SQs) with reference to sentence final particles (SFPs) in Japanese. Japanese is very rich in SFPs, which encompass a complicated and diverse range of usages, from typical to atypical, according to context and interpersonal relationships (see Davis 2009; Endo 2007, 2012, 2020; Endo and Haegeman 2019; Kamio 1994; Takiura 2008; Tanaka 2000; Tokieda 1951 for various properties of SFPs in Japanese). Among various properties of SQs and NSQs shown by particles in German and Japanese, I will mainly focus on the information-seeking properties, which will be relevant to the discussion to follow.

Let us first examine the contrast between the information-seeking SQs in German exemplified in (1a), where the speaker expects an answer from the addressee, and the non-information-seeking NSQs in (1b), where

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the workshop “Non-canonical questions in French, German and beyond” held at the University of Konstanz in November 21–22, 2019. I am grateful to the audience for questions and comments, which was of great help to revise the present paper. I am also very grateful to the reviewers for helpful comments. Special thanks go to Andrew Radford, Hisashi Noda and Bartosz Wiland for discussing this topic. This research is funded by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) and (A) of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Project 16K02639 and 19H00532).

*Corresponding author: Yoshio Endo, Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Japan, E-mail: endoling@gmail.com

in the presence of the discourse particles *nur* and *bloß*, the speaker is more interested in expressing his/her emotion than seeking information from the addressee. Bayer and Obenauer (2011: 468) call the NSQ in (1b) ‘Can’t-Find-the-Value-of-x Question (CfvQ).’¹

- (1) a. Wo liegt meine Brille?
 where lies my glasses
 ‘Where did I/you put my glasses?’
 b. Wo liegt **nur/bloß** meine Brille?
 where lies **nur/bloß** my glasses
 ‘Where on earth did I put my glasses? (I have already looked everywhere).’
 (Bayer and Obenauer 2011: 468)

The German NSQs and NSQs in (1a and b) correspond to the Japanese NSQ and the NSQ in (2a and b), where just like the German case we saw immediately above, the bold SFP *na* yields a NSQ. What distinguishes Japanese NSQs from German NSQs is that Japanese NSQs have a particle in the clause-final position, while German NSQs have a particle in the clause-medial position.

- (2) a. Doko-ni megane-o oita ka?²
 where-Dat glasses-Acc put Q
 ‘Where did I/you put my glasses?’
 b. Doko-ni megane-o oitta ka **na**?
 where-Dat glasses-Acc put Q SFP
 Where on earth did I put my glasses? (I have already looked everywhere).

The semantic import of the Japanese SFP *na* in (2b) is to signal the expression of weak confirmation by the speaker about the proposition based on some evidence. For instance, in the absence of the SFP *na*, the sentence in (3) is a neutral statement reporting the fact that a house is on fire. On the other hand, in the presence of the SFP *na*, the sentence implies that the speaker has some evidence for the proposition such as the fire siren. A reviewer asks what is the contribution of the evidential SFP *na* to the interpretation of NSQ in (2b). To understand this point, consider Maslova’s (2003) view that evidentiality reflects the perspective of the speaker. To be more specific, evidentials in interrogatives, as in declaratives, are understood as giving the speaker’s ‘take’ on the described event, where the speaker is ‘wondering’ about something rather than seeking information from the addressee. Thus, in the NSQ in (2b) the combination of interrogative marking *ka* and evidential element *na* indicates that the speaker is ‘wondering’ about the exact location of his/her glasses without seeking information from the addressee. What is crucial here is the fact that in the presence of the SFP *na*, the sentence in (3) is most naturally interpreted as a monologue without the addressee. The fact that the SFP *na* is used as a monologue is captured by assuming that it carries the feature [+speaker-oriented].

- (3) Kazi da (**na**).
 fire Cop (SFP)
 ‘(I guess) it is a fire’

With this point in mind, let us consider another type of NSQ in German exemplified in (4), i.e., the rhetorical question, which is slightly different from the CfvQ in (1).

¹ See also Abraham (2018), Trotzke (2017), and Dörre and Trotzke (2019) for NSQs in German. See also Obenauer (2004, 2006) on various properties of non-standard questions.

² The following abbreviations are used in the rest of the paper:

Acc = accusative, Asp = aspect, Cop = copula, Dat = dative, Fin = finite, Imp = imperative, Neg = negation, Nom = nominative, Q = question, SFP = sentence final particle.

- (4) Wer zahlt schon gerne Steuern?
 who pays schon gladly taxes
 'Who likes paying taxes? (Nobody!)' (Bayer and Obenauer 2011: 468)³

This rhetorical question can be most naturally translated into Japanese in (5), where the sentence is suffixed by the SFP *yo*, and not by *na* – the SFP we saw above. The SFP *yo* indicates the speaker's mental attitude that the stated proposition before the SFP is under the control of the speaker (Takiura 2008). Accordingly, it is typical to use the SFP *yo* to elicit a sense of insistence or to get the addressee's attention (e.g., Davis 2009; Kamio 1994). What is crucial about the SFP *yo* in the present context is that the sentence suffixed by the SFP *yo* is not used as a monologue. Thus, when the NSQ in (3) is suffixed by the SFP *yo*, instead of the SFP *na*, it can no longer be interpreted as the speaker's monologue but implies the presence of the addressee. In this sense, the SFP *yo* in (5) can be characterized by the feature [+addressee-oriented]. I will discuss further properties of the SFP *yo* later on.

- (5) Dare-ga sukide zeekin nanka harau **ka yo**⁴
 who-Nom like.to tax epithet pay Q SFP

So far, we have looked at two types of NSQs in German and Japanese, both of which make use of particles to form NSQs. A note of caution is in order here. Although German and Japanese NSQs are similar in yielding NSQs by making use of particles, particles of these two languages are not entirely identical. As the careful reader might have already realized, the particles in Japanese we saw above can be used in non-interrogative sentences as well, which would not be possible with the particle mentioned above in German.⁵ In this paper, I will not discuss the issue of where this difference between the two languages comes from. Rather, I will concentrate on the common property of these two languages to create NSQs by using particles, especially the property of particles modifying or fine-tuning illocutionary force. To illustrate this point, let us consider the fact, originally pointed out by Jacobs (1986, 1991), that discourse particles in German modify different illocutionary forces like directives in the sense of Searle (1985). For instance, consider the sentences in (6), which

3 Bartosz Wiland (pers. comm.) points out that there is an interesting overlap of NSQ markers with 'aggressively non-D-linked' functions and modifiers. This is particularly visible in German, where the position of the aggressively non-D-linked modifier and the NSQ particle is the same:

- (i) Wo liegt {nur/zum Teufel} meine Brille?
 where lies {nur/to devil} my glasses
 'Where the hell are my glasses?'

This holds for Polish as well, which patterns with English in not having specific NSQ markers:

- (ii) Gdzie (do diabła) leżą moje okulary?
 where (to devil) lie my glasses
 'Where (the hell) are my glasses?'

This Polish fact also applies to the contexts in (6) below for German. Note that all obscene phrases will also come in this slot, as illustrated by the following Polish sentences:

- (iii) Zadzwońcie (do diabła/kurwa/...) po policję!
 call-IMP (to devil/fuck/...) for police
 'Call (the hell/fuck) the police!'

The overlap of NSQ markers with 'aggressively non-D-linked' functions and modifiers is also seen in Japanese. For instance, the Japanese NSQ in (5) cannot be preceded by phrases such as *A, B sosite C no uti* 'among Mr. A, Mr. B and Mr. C', which would not go well with a non-D-linked sentence. However, the overlap is not entirely complete, because the Japanese NSQ in (4) can be preceded by phrases like *kittyin, beddorum, sosite basuruum no uti* 'among the kitchen, bedroom and bathroom', with the verb changed into *oita* 'located'. More research is required in this area.

4 In Japanese, interrogative sentences are typically formed in two ways, one of which is to have a final rising intonation and the other of which is to suffix the question particle *ka* to a sentence. In the following section, I will discuss more properties of the interrogative sentence in Japanese.

5 In fact, *nur* and *bloß* can be used also in declaratives, but as focus particles, not as discourse particles; see Dörre and Trotzke (2019). I am grateful to a reviewer for pointing out this fact.

are borrowed from Coniglio and Zegrean (2012: 233) (cf. Coniglio 2014 for the discussion of discourse particles in German). Here, the clause type is imperative in all cases, but the pragmatic strength of the order is modified and ordered according to the meaning of particles.

- (6) Ruf die Polizei!
 call the police
 ‘Call the police!’
 a. Ruf halt die Polizei!
 b. Ruf mal die Polizei!
 c. Ruf doch die Polizei!
 d. Ruf JA die Polizei!

In parallel to this, illocutionary force in Japanese is modified by various types of SFPs, where the pragmatic strength in (7) below is ordered in the same way as the German case above, as shown by Dohi (2020).

- (7) Keisatu-o yobi-nasai.
 police-Acc call-IMP
 ‘Call police!’
 a. Keisatu-o yobi-nasai na.⁶
 police-Acc call-IMP-SFP
 b. Keisatu-o yobi-nasai ne.
 police-Acc call-IMP-SFP
 c. Keisatu-o yobi-nasai yo.
 police-Acc call-IMP-SFP
 d. Keisatu-o yobi-nasai tteba
 police-Acc call-IMP-SFP

3 NSQs in English

Keeping in mind what we saw in the previous section, let us next examine NSQs in English with special attention to negative islands, which prohibit an adjunct *wh*-element such as *how* from moving across a negative element such as *not*. Shlonsky and Soare (2011) note that unlike *why*, *how* cannot cross negative islands, as illustrated in (8):⁷

- (8) a. Why didn’t Geraldine fix her bike? (Shlonsky and Soare 2011)
 b. *How didn’t Geraldine fix her bike?

However, Andrew Radford (pers. comm.) points out that (8b) is acceptable for him in the following kind of context in (9a). This is a kind of rhetorical negative question, found in a discourse like (9b). Note that the exclamation mark after the question mark marks this sentence as a rhetorical question. There is something different about rhetorical negative questions – for example, they do not license polarity items like (partitive) *any*, as in (10). In addition, they have a different intonation from operator questions.⁸

⁶ As a reviewer correctly points out, the SFPs *na* and *yo* can be used in interrogative sentences as well as imperative sentences. When the SFP *na* is suffixed to a sentence, only speaker’s epistemic attitude, not evidential interpretation, is felt in imperative sentences. At this point, it is not clear to me whether there are two types of *na*, one of which is an evidential marker and the other of which is a simple epistemic marker. More study is required in this area.

⁷ Rizzi (2001, 2004) attributes the asymmetry in (8) to the fact that *why*, unlike *how*, is displaced from a position lower than negation to cross negative islands. In contrast, *why* is base generated in a position higher than neg, and thus does not cross negative islands. Shlonsky and Soare (2011) follow Rizzi’s idea.

⁸ See Endo (2018) for inter-speaker variations of *how come* questions.

- (9) a. He tried every conceivable way to fix his bike – indeed how DIDN'T he try to fix it?
 (= Is there any possible way he could have used but didn't in order to fix the bike?)
 b. A: What does Chomsky know about syntax?
 B: What DOESN'T Chomsky know about syntax?!⁹

(10) Boy, didn't we have some/*any great times together?!

Here, we see that NSQs in English are formed in a way different from NSQs in German and Japanese in that English does not make use of particles to yield NSQs. To see this point, let us consider the following *how come* questions.

- (11) How come the sky is blue?
 i.e. Why is the sky blue?¹⁰

Attributing the observation to Andrew Simpson (pers. comm.), Tsai (2008: 89) mentions the difference in meaning between *how come* questions and *why* questions: *why* questions involve no special expectation about whether or not a given state of affairs should hold, whereas *how come* questions expresses surprise that a particular state of affairs should hold, as illustrated in (11). However, it is not the case that *how come* always express surprise that a particular state of affairs should hold. For instance, there is no surprise in what B says in (12) below, just curiosity and *how come* sounds less invasive than *why* in this context.¹¹

- (12) A: I've gotta go to the doctor this afternoon.
 B: How come?
 A: Oh, the cut on my finger has got infected.

Where does this difference of *how come* questions come from? To find an answer to this question, it would be helpful to consider the following sentences from the comic *Peanuts*, where the Japanese sentences corresponding to the two types of *how come* questions we saw above are clearly expressed by different SFPs.

- (13) a. Lucy: How come you never send me flowers? (Schultz 2008)
 Snyder: Because I don't love you.
 b. Lucy: Doo-site watasi-ni itido.mo hana-o
 how.come me-to never flower-Acc
 okutte kurenai no?
 send benefit Q
 Snyder: Kimi-ga kirai dakara¹²
 you-Nom dislike because

- (14) a. Linus: How come you never bring me milkshake?
 Lucy: When he is through, you can lick the straw.
 (Schultz 2008)
 b. Linus: Doosite boku-ni mirukuseeki-o
 how.come me-to milkshake-Acc
 mottekitekure nai no sa
 bring.benefit Neg Fin SFP

⁹ See Endo (2007, 2020) for the mechanism of escaping negative islands like (9).

¹⁰ As a reviewer correctly points out, *how come* questions behave quite differently from *why* questions in many respects. See Endo (2015), Fitzpatrick (2005), and Radford (2018) for various syntactic and semantic aspects of *how come* questions and *why* questions.

¹¹ I am grateful to Andrew Radford (pers. comm.) for discussing this point with the dialogue in (12).

¹² Here, the direct object *kimi* 'you' is suffixed by the nominative Case particle *ga*. This is because stative predicates like *kirai* 'dislike' in Japanese may license the nominative Case particle *ga* for the direct object.

In (13), Lucy addresses a *how come* question to Snyder and receives a response with the sentence prefixed by *because*. Here, the corresponding Japanese *how come* question in (13b), which is translated by Syunzi Tanigawa, sounds like a SQ suffixed by no SFP, where mild curiosity is felt by Lucy. In contrast, in (14), although Linus uses a *how come* question with Lucy, he does not receive a response prefixed by *because* but only a comment from her. The corresponding Japanese *how come* question sounds like a NSQ with strong irritation expressed by the speaker. In this case, the sentence in Japanese is suffixed by the SFP *sa*, as in (14b). In the comic, Linus's face and gesture show stronger emotion in (14) than we see on Lucy's face in (13) (see Endo 2019 for this point with pictures). At this point, one may naturally wonder what is the SFP *sa* creating a NSQ with the meaning of surprise in (14). The SFP *sa* is used to report the speaker's familiarity with the proposition, implying that the sentence suffixed by this particle should be taken as a matter of course. According to Uyeno (1971), the meaning of the SFP *sa* is contrasted with the meaning of the SFPs *yoo* 'appear,' *rasii* 'seem,' and *soo* 'hear,' which are used when the speaker's judgment is made based on appearance. The SFP *sa*, in contrast, is used when the speaker's judgment is already made based on his/her own supposition or inner feeling. Because the speaker's judgment is already made in uttering the SFP *sa*, the speaker's supposition is taken to be discourse-familiar, and thus, we cannot start a discourse with a sentence with the SFP *sa*, as illustrated by the following contrast.^{13, 14}

- (15) a. Kore nani? / ??Kore nani sa?
 this what this what SFP
 'What is this?'
 b. *Doo suru sa?
 how do SFP
 'So, what are you going to do?'

Based on this fact, I suggest that the SFP *sa* expresses the speaker's epistemic judgment. How can we capture this property of the Japanese SFP *sa* in the meaning of surprise in *how come* question? Cinque (1999) postulates various functional heads to host mood elements in the clause structure. According to this idea, the particle *sa* can be thought of occupying the head position of the functional projection of epistemic mood to give rise to express the speaker's inner emotion of surprise in NSQs. Assuming Chomsky's (2001: 2) Uniformity Principle to the effect that in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, assume language to be uniform, I suggest that *how come* questions expressing surprise in (14) are formed by covertly activating the functional head of epistemic mood that hosts the Japanese SFP *sa* to create the meaning of surprise. In this sense, we might consider English as a "silent/telegraphic language" where those functional heads that are utilized to yield NSQs in German and Japanese remain silent or unpronounced.¹⁵ See Endo (2020) for the mechanism of covertly activating a functional head responsible for a mood element in the framework of the cartography of syntactic structures (Cinque 1999; Rizzi 2014).

¹³ See also Hasunuma (2015) for various properties of the SFP *na*.

¹⁴ This type of old information might be expressed by auxiliary verbs in English. Attributing the observation to Robin Lakoff (pers. comm.), Uyeno (1971) notes a similar effect with English epistemic modals like *be going to*, as opposed to *will*.

(i) a. I'll buy some roses.
 b. I am going to buy some roses.

Suppose a person goes to the florist to buy some flowers. After taking a look around the store, he might say the sentence in (i-a) to the clerk. On the other hand, if he had the idea of buying some roses ahead of time, he would be more likely to say the sentence in (i-b).

¹⁵ The particles *sa* and *na* are in complementary distribution in that the particle *sa* cannot be suffixed to the Q particle *ka*, but only to the particle *no*. See Endo (2007) on this point.

4 Counter-expectation

Finally, let us explore the possibility of further splitting addressee-oriented NSQs into several types by looking at another SFP *no*, which expresses the speaker's counter-expectation in the matrix clause. To see what the speaker's counter-expectation looks like, consider the following sentences in (16a and b). In the absence of the SFP *no*, the speaker asks the addressee if he/she would like to eat what the speaker recommends. In contrast, in the presence of the SFP *no*, the speaker sounds more interested in expressing his/her surprise than seeking information from the addressee while witnessing the addressee about to eat what the speaker does not expect him/her to eat. In this sense, the SFP *no* can be thought of carrying the feature [+counter-expectation] to form NSQs.¹⁶ A reviewer asks what is the exact difference between “inner emotion of surprise” expressed by the SFP *sa* we saw in the previous section and “counter-expectation” expressed by the SFP *no* we are looking at here. One of the most distinguishing properties between these two SFPs lies in the fact that the SFP *no*, not the SFP *sa*, serves as the licenser of *wh*-expressions asking for reason such as *naze* ‘why’ in Japanese. To see this point, consider the sentences in (16c–e) below. In colloquial Japanese, interrogative sentences can be formed simply by having a final rising intonation as in (16c and d) except for *why*-questions as in (16e), which always require the SFP *no* as in (16f). Interestingly, when the SFP *no* is suffixed to a non-*why* question as in (16b), the sentence always carries the meaning of what might be called “concealed *why*-questions” in the sense that the sentence is interpreted as *why is it that ...?*, especially in the matrix clause.¹⁷ Thus, the accurate translation of the sentence in (16b) is *Why is it that you eat this*, where the speaker sounds confused or irritated without seeing any reasons for the addressee to eat what the speaker does not expect him/her to.¹⁸ Based on this fact, we can reasonably assume that “counter-expectation” expressed by the SFP *no* is quite different from “inner emotion of surprise” expressed by the SFP *sa*, which has no concealed *why*-question interpretation.¹⁹

- (16) a. Kore taberu?
 this eat
 ‘Would you eat this?’
 b. Kore taberu **no**?
 this eat Fin
 ‘What!! Do you really eat this?’ (=surprise)

¹⁶ The sense of counter-expectation triggered by the particle *no* is prominently attested especially when we have a minimal pair of sentences, one of which contains the particle *no* and the other of which does not. I am grateful to Hisashi Noda (pers. comm.) for discussing this topic.

¹⁷ One may naturally wonder why the particle *no* creates the speaker's counter-expectation interpretation in the matrix clause. This seems to stem from the following properties of the matrix CP. The clause periphery has traditionally been treated as having the status of CP, but Rizzi (1997) has argued for decomposing CP into a set of separate dedicated functional projections for force, topic, focus, interrogative, finiteness and so forth, where in the absence of an intervening element, the highest functional element (force) and the lowest functional element (finiteness) in the CP zone are amalgamated to express various clause types like interrogative, declarative, etc. Based on discourse particles in West Flemish, Haegeman and Hill (2014) postulate a functional projection higher than force for speech-act. Just like West Flemish, Japanese SFPs are housed in the highest functional projection for speech-act, which is amalgamated with the lowest functional projection *no* in the CP zone to express various speech-acts like counter-expectation. Because speech acts describe properties of *utterances* not of clauses, only sentences, i.e. the matrix clauses, can be associated with speech acts, not subordinate or embedded clauses, and thus the functional projection for speech-act does not appear in the embedded clause to be amalgamated with the element *no* at issue to express various speech-acts such as counter-expectation.

¹⁸ One may naturally wonder exactly how the SFP *no* creates the concealed *why*-question interpretation. Rizzi (2001, 2004) shows that *perché* ‘why’ in Italian appears in the functional projection of Int(terrogative) to be interpreted as asking for reason. The SFP *no* might occupy the same functional projection of IntP to create the concealed *why*-question interpretation. More research is required in this area.

¹⁹ Giorgi (2020) investigates the properties of counter-expectational surprise *yes-no* questions in Italian, introduced by the adversative particle *ma*, where the element *ma* is claimed to be a discourse head, projecting a syntactic structure analogous to that of normal syntactic heads. Giorgi and Farra (2019) claim that some appropriate prosody and gesture are triggered by a dedicated projection housing the element *ma* in the syntactic structure, which is read off at the interface with the sensory-motor component.

- c. Itu dekakeru?
when leave.
‘When are you leaving?’
- d. Dokoni dekakeru?
where go.
‘Where are you going?’
- e. ??Naze dekakeru?
 why leave.
 ‘Why are you leaving?’
- f. Naze dekakeru no?
 why leave counter-expectation
 ‘Why are you leaving?’
- g. Itu dekakeru no?
 when leave counter-expectation.
 ‘Why is it that you can’t decide when you are leaving’

This particle *no* can also be suffixed by the addressee-oriented particle *yo* that we saw earlier, as in (17) below. Here, in the presence of the two particles *no* and *yo* another type of addressee-oriented NSQ is formed, where the speaker expresses aggressive attitude toward the addressee, which I call the aggressive-attitude type.

- (17) Nani yat teru no **yo**?²⁰
 What do Asp Fin SFP
 ‘What the hell are you doing?’

In order to see what aggressive attitude looks like, let us consider the following sentences uttered by Lucy in the comic *Peanuts*:

- (18) a. Lucy: If anyone hits a ball to right field, let me know.
 a’. Dareka-ga raito-ni utta-ra osiete ne
 anyone-Nom right-to hit-if tell.me SFP
- (19) a. Lucy: You’d better watch what you write in that autobiography!
 a’. Zizyoden-ni kakukotoni-wa kiotuketa.
 autobiography-to what.you.write watch
 hoogaii wa yo.
 had.better SFP SFP

In (18), Lucy is asking a favor of Charlie Brown; she seems to be able to read Charlie’s mind. In the Japanese translation in (18a’), the sentence is suffixed by the particle *ne* carrying the feature [+empathy], which is related to mind reading (see Kamio (1994, 2002) for the discussion of empathy revolving around the particle *ne*). In contrast, in (19) Lucy gives Snoopy an angry warning, where she does not seem to have empathy towards Snoopy because when a speaker gives an angry warning to an addressee, s(he) would be more concerned with expressing his/her emotion than worrying about how the addressee would feel as a result of his/her warning and anger (see Endo 2019 for the exposition and pictures). The corresponding Japanese sentence is suffixed by the SFP *yo* without the feature [+empathy]. Given this, the meaning of aggressive attitude expressed by the

²⁰ A reviewer asks whether the SFP *yo* in (17) is the same type as the SFP *yo* we saw in the previous section. The answer seems to be in the affirmative in that the SFP *yo* in (17) and the SFP *yo* in the previous section share the feature [+addressee-oriented].

particles *no* and *yo* in (17) can be attributed to the combination of the feature [–empathy] carried by the SFP *yo* and the feature [+counter-expectation] carried by the SFP *no*.²¹

5 Conclusion

To conclude, I have discussed the nature of NSQs in English and German by comparing them with Japanese with special attention to various types of particles. I showed that NSQs can be classified into the speaker-oriented type and the addressee-oriented type. I further suggested that the addressee-oriented NSQs can be further divided into the counter-expectation type and the aggressive attitude type by looking at the meaning of particles in Japanese.

References

- Abraham, Werner. 2018. Adreas Trozke: The grammar of emphasis: From information structure to expressive dimension. *Folia Linguistica* 53(2). 535–542.
- Bayer, Josef & Hans-Georg Obenauer. 2011. Discourse particles, clause structure, and question types. *The Linguistic Review* 28. 449–491.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coniglio, Marco. 2014. The fine structure of force: On the interaction of modal particles with illocutionary force and clause type. In Cardinaletti Anna, Guglielmo Cinque & Yoshio Endo (eds.), *On peripheries: Exploring clause initial and clause final positions*, 103–140. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo.
- Coniglio, Marco & Iulia Zegrean. 2012. Splitting up force. Evidence from discourse particles. In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachael Nye (eds.), *Main clause phenomena: New horizons*, 229–255. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Davis, Christopher. 2009. Decisions, dynamics, and the Japanese particle *yo*. *Journal of Semantics* 26. 329–366.
- Dohi, Atsushi. 2020. CP-internal discourse particles and the split ForceP hypothesis. *Lingua* 233. 68–87.
- Dörre, Laura & Andreas Trotzke. 2019. The processing of secondary meaning: An experimental comparison of focus and modal particles in *wh*-questions. In Gutzmann Daniel & Katharina Turgay (eds.), *Secondary content: The semantics and pragmatics of side issues*, 143–167. Leiden: Brill.
- Endo, Yoshio. 2007. *Locality and information structure*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Endo, Yoshio. 2012. Illocutionary force and discourse particles in the syntax of Japanese. In Werner Abraham & Elizabeth Leiss (eds.), *Modality and theory of mind elements across languages*, 405–424. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Endo, Yoshio. 2015. Two ReasonPs: What are(‘nt) you coming to the United States for? In Ur Shlonsky (ed.), *Beyond functional sequence*, 220–231. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Endo, Yoshio. 2018. Variation in *wh*-expressions asking for a reason. *Linguistic Variation* 18(2). 299–314.
- Endo, Yoshio. 2019. Exploring right/left peripheries: Expressive meanings in questions, *Fachbereichs Linguistik/Working Papers of the Department of Linguistics*, number #130, 69–90. Available at: https://kops.uni-konstanz.de/bitstream/handle/123456789/47461/Bayer_2-kqn8xj9d41c69.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- Endo, Yoshio. 2020. Information structure, null case particle and sentence final discourse particle. In Modicum Pierre-Yves & Olivier Duplâtre (eds.), *Information-structural perspectives in discourse particles*, 224–250. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Endo, Yoshio & Liliane Haegeman. 2019. Adverbial clauses and adverbial concord. *Glossa* 4(1). 1–32.
- Fitzpatrick, Justin. 2005. The whys and how comes of presupposition and NPI Licensing in Questions. In Proceedings of the 24th west coast conference on formal linguistics, 138–145. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Giorgi, Alessandra. 2020. *Ma non era rosso? (But wasn't it red?): On counter-expectational questions in Italian*. Ms. Venice: Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

²¹ The relationship between the SFP *ne* and the feature [+empathy] can be seen in developmental disorders as well. Watamaki (1997) reports that children with autism do not use the SFP *ne* at all, or even if they do, use it very infrequently. Watamaki attributes this to the fact that children with autism do not have the ability to share information with others, in contrast to normally developing children, who typically start using the SFP *ne* between 18 and 24 months. Watamaki also reports that children with autism do use the SFP *yo* like normally developing children. This is attributed to the fact that children with autism do not have to share information with others when using the SFP *yo*.

- Giorgi, Alessandra & Chiara Dal Farra. 2019. On the syntax/pragmatics interface: Expressing surprise and disapproval. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 16(3). 335–361.
- Haegeman, Liliane & Virginia Hill. 2014. West Flemish verb-based discourse markers and the articulation of the speech act layer. *Studia Linguistica* 68(1). 116–139.
- Hasunuma, Akiko. 2015. Syuuzyosi *sa* no honsituteki kinoo [Main functions of the sentence final particle *sa*]. *Nihongo nihonbungaku* 25. 1–27.
- Jacobs, Joachim. 1986. Abt.nungsmittel als Illokutionstypmodifikatoren. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 27. 100–111.
- Jacobs, Joachim. 1991. On the semantics of modal particles. In Werner Abraham (ed.), *Discourse particles: Descriptive and theoretical investigations on the logical, syntactical, and pragmatic properties of discourse particles in German*, 141–162. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kamio, Akio. 1994. The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21. 67–100.
- Kamio, Akio. 2002. *Zyooohoo no nawabari riron* [Theory of territory of information], 2nd edn. Tokyo: Taisyuukan.
- Maslova, Elena S. 2003. Evidentiality in Yukaghir. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Studies in evidentiality*, 219–235. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 2004. Nonstandard wh-questions and alternative checkers in Pagotto. In Horst Lohnstein & Susanne Trissler (eds.), *The syntax and semantics of the left periphery*, 343–383. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 2006. Special interrogatives – left periphery, wh-doubling, and (apparently) optional elements. In Doetjes Jenny & Gonzalves Paz (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2004 – Selected papers from ‘Going Romance 2004’*, 247–273. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Radford, Andrew. 2018. *Colloquial English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position of ‘Int(errogative)’ in the left periphery of the clause. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current studies in Italian syntax*, 267–296. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and beyond*, 104–131. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2014. The cartography of syntactic structures: Locality and freezing effects on movement. In Cardinaletti Anna, Guglielmo Cinque & Yoshio Endo (eds.), *On peripheries: Exploring clause initial and clause final positions*, 29–60. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo Publishing.
- Schultz, Charles. 2008. *Snoopy comic selection 1970–1990*. Translated by Syuntaro Tanigawa. Tokyo: Kadokawa.
- Searle, John R. 1985. *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shlonsky, Ur & Gabriela Soare. 2011. Where’s ‘why’? *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(4). 651–669.
- Takiura, Masato. 2008. *Poraitonesu nyuumon* [An introduction to politeness theory]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2000. The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32. 1135–1176.
- Tokieda, Motoki. 1951. Taizin kankei o koosei suru zyosi, zyodoosi [Particles and auxiliary verbs that construct interpersonal relationship]. *Kokugo kokubun no kenkyuu* 29(9). 1–10.
- Trotzke, Andreas. 2017. *The grammar of emphasis: From information structure to the expressive dimension*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan. 2008. Left periphery and *how-why* alternations. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17. 83–115.
- Uyeno, Tazuko. 1971. *A study of Japanese modality: A performance analysis of sentence particles*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan PhD Dissertation.
- Watamaki, Toru. 1997. Ziheisyoozi niokeru kyookan hyoogen *ne* no ketuzyo. [Lack of the particle-*ne* in conversation by a child with autism: A case study]. *Japanese Journal of Developmental Disabilities* 19. 146–157.