Attributing illocutionary acts in Spanish by the tag question *¿no?*
Angelika Kiss, University of Toronto

Tag questions are typically analyzed in terms of Speaker's and/or Addressee's attitude to the proposition expressed by the anchor (e.g. Ladd 1981, Wiltschko & Heim 2016). Tag questions that such analyses build on have declarative anchors, expressing an assertion. In peninsular Spanish, the tag question *¿no?* 'no' can follow imperatives (García Vizcaíno 2005), interrogatives, and exclamatives (Osa 2017) as well, see some examples from CORLEC:

(1)	pues qué lo vamos a hacer, ¿no?	'What can we do about it, right?'	(ACON007B)
(2)	Dejamos eso, ¿no?	'Why don't we leave it at that?'	(BCON048A)
(3)	¡Qué raro! ¿no?	'How weird, isn't it?'	(CCON028A)

Osa's (2017) is the only proposal that aims to account for both assertions and cases like in (1)–(3). According to her, *¿no?* makes the speech act tentative, it postpones the Speaker's commitment to making the discourse move until the Addressee's approval, making the speech act less face-threatening. This explains the oddity of performative utterances with *¿no?*, such as (4), but it does not explain why *¿no?* appears with rhetorical questions only, such as (1), and not with genuine questions, such as (5).

| (4) | Te lo prometo, #¿no? | 'I promise you, NO?' | (Osa 2017 (6)) |
| (5) | Cuántos años tienes, #¿no? | 'How old are you, NO?' | |

This proposal has further unanswered questions: cohortatives seem to host *¿no?* readily, unlike real commands (García Vizcaíno 2005); and performative utterances (Searle 1989) are unacceptable with *¿no?*, even assertions, although in Osa's analysis, they should be acceptable.

To account for the distribution of *¿no?* we argue that it attributes the Speaker's speech act tentatively to the Addressee, offering "authorship" of the speech act, and asks for Addressee's acknowledgement for this attribution. The Speaker is biased towards a positive answer to *¿no?*, she thinks that Addressee is very likely to agree. Paraphrased, a speech act followed by *¿no?* amounts to saying: "I say [speech act], and you would also say [speech act], wouldn't you?". The Addressee is asked to commit to making the same speech act so that the context of the attributed speech act reverses its values for Speaker and Addressee, while other parameters of the context, such as the time, place and the world (Searle and Vanderveken 1985) remain the same. Such a switch between Speaker and Addressee cannot be done with most speech acts, only with those that do not involve the Speaker's and Addressee's person in their illocutionary points as described in Searle & Vanderveken's (1985) illocutionary logic. These are speech acts that have a *world-to-word* component in their direction of fit: commissives, directives, declarations (and I argue that some expressives belong here, too). Speech acts the illocutionary point of which lack such a reference to both the Speaker and the Addressee are attributable, cf. (3). On the other hand, the oddity of (explicit) performatives with *¿no?* is explained by Searle's (1989) analysis, according to which all performatives are implicitly declarations, which are in turn not attributable.

The proposal explains the facts about genuine questions and commands: these are bad if attributed because they would result in a two-way request, which is pragmatically odd. Rhetorical questions, on the other hand, are used felicitously if the answer to them is obvious to the speakers (Caponigro & Sprouse 2007), thus there is no two-way request if used with *¿no?*.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.

Caponigro, I. & J. Sprouse (2007). Rhetorical questions as questions. In E. Puig-Waldmüller (ed.) *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, 121–133. Barcelona, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Corpus Oral de Referencia de la Lengua Española Contemporáneo (CORLEC). http://www.lllf.uam.es/ESP/Corlec.html

García Vizcaíno, J. M. (2005). El uso de los apéndices modalizadores *¿no?* y *¿eh?* [The use of the modal particles *¿no?* and *¿eh?*]. In L. Sayahi & M. Westmoreland (eds.) *Selected Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, 89–101. Somerville, MA.

Ladd, R. D. (1981). A First Look at the Semantics and Pragmatics of Negaitve Questions and Tag Questions. In: *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistic Society* 17, 164–171.

Osa, Adriana (2017). Negotiation of discourse moves: right periphery tags. In: V. Petukhova and Y. Tian (eds.): *Proceedings of the 21st Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue*. 97–103. Saarbrücken, Universität des Saarlandes.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. & D. Vanderveken (1985). *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1989). How performatives work. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12, pp. 535–558.

Wiltschko, M. & J. Heim (2016). The syntax of confirmationals. In: G. Kaltenböck, E. Keizer and A. Lohmann (Eds.): *Outside the Clause. Form and function of extra-clausal constituents*, 305–340. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.