

胡德明  
◆ 著

# 现代汉语反问句研究

安徽人民出版社

博士文丛  
• 第五辑



博士文丛  
第五辑

# 现代汉语反问句研究

蹇德明 著

安徽人民出版社

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

现代汉语反问句研究 / 胡德明著. —合肥: 安徽人民出版社,  
2010.3

ISBN 978-7-212-03835-9

I. 现… II. 胡… III. 汉语—句法—研究 IV. H146.3

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2010) 第 045044 号

## 现 代 汉 语 反 问 句 研 究

胡德明 著

---

出版发行: 安徽人民出版社

地 址: 合肥市政务文化新区圣泉路 1118 号出版传媒广场 8 楼

发 行 部: 0551-3533258 3533292 (传真) 邮编: 230071

组 编: 安徽师范大学编辑部 电话: 0553-3937079 3883579

经 销: 新华书店

印 刷: 芜湖新欣传媒有限公司

开 本: 787×960 1/32 印张: 12.75 字数: 355 千

版 次: 2010 年 6 月第 1 版 2010 年 6 月第 1 次印刷

标准书号: ISBN 978-7-212-03835-9

定 价: 35.00 元

---

本版图书凡印刷、装订错误可及时向承印厂调换

## 内容提要

本书对现代汉语反问句的语音特征、句法特点进行了较为系统的、全面的描写。在此基础上,依托会话含义和新格赖斯会话含义理论、言语行为和间接言语行为理论、关联理论以及逻辑学中的推理,提出使用反问句的语义语用条件,构建反问句产生模式假设,然后用语言事实验证假设,再用这个模式对反问句句法、语义、语用等问题作出了统一的解释。

本书在充分描写的基础上穷尽地归纳了反问句特有格式 37 种,提出反问句特有的语调类型:特高调和高降调。系统总结了反问句的重音模式:特指型反问句中,“什么”、“怎么”、“哪”、“哪儿”等疑问词往往不带重音,如果带重音,那么往往带对比重音;反问句中往往有某个成分带有对比重音;反问句中如果没有对比项,那么句中的一些动词前的副词等修饰成分和情态动词经常带有对比重音;“有”“是”“这”“那”等成分在反问句中经常带对比重音。

反问句产生机制假设由四个语义语用条件和运作过程构成。

行为条件:存在一个言论或行为  $q$ ,反问句说话人认为  $q$  不对,欲否定  $q$ 。

关系条件:要否定  $q$ ,可以通过否定言论或行为  $q$  的前提  $p$  (prerequisite)来实现,那么就必先找到  $q$  的前提  $p$ 。说话人推断出  $q$  的前提  $p$ 。建构  $p$  与  $q$  之间的反蕴涵逻辑关系:只有  $p$  才  $q$ , $p$  反蕴涵  $q$ 。所以, $p$  假则  $q$  不合理。

实质条件:说话人运用反问韵律形式和限定话语朝说话人所期待的方向理解的语句形式对  $p$  提问,说出反问句。

语气条件:在说话人看来,语境不支持  $p$ , $p$  假,所以  $q$  不合理。

本书认为,反问句是疑问句的一种用法类型,是运用表达与命题意义相反的语义内容的疑问手段对经由推理得出的某个言论或行为的前提发问,使得该言论或行为的前提不能成立,从而达到否定该言论或行为的目的的疑问句。反问句说话人心中虽然没有疑,但对言论或行为前提的提问却是真问。对言论或行为的前提提问是反问句区别于其他一切疑问句的本质属性之一。说话人推断言论行为的前提涉及三种推理形式:充分条件假言推理、必要条件假言推理和回溯推理。其中回溯推理是说话人使用的最主要的推理方式。确立了判定反问句的三个规则:“否定+命题”的语义规则、对言论或行为的前提提问的语用规则和能够充当答语的形式规则。

本书认为,反问句否定语义来自语气条件——反问语气。反问语气是通过语法形式表达的说话人针对句子命题的一种主观否定态度。特指型反问句否定语义的来源有三种情况:一、疑问代词所代替的人、事、物、原因等,在说话人看来,在语境中并不存在;二、说话人主观认为疑问代词指称对象与听话人对疑问代词的指称对象的理解完全不同或正好相反;三、说话人心目中对某类事物或某类行为有了一个标准,预先设定某个事物或行为远远达不到这个标准,再故意对该事物或行为提问,以说明它不符合这个标准,从而产生否定语义。是非型反问句的否定语义直接来源于说话人的主观否定态度。反问句的否定语义多种多样,否定语义在字面意义和语用含义中都有体现。反问句的否定不是句法上的否定,而是语义-语用层面的否定,是从价值观念层面作出的否定。反问句是表达价值判断的疑问句。反问句具有主观性:反问句的否定是主观否定, $p$ 是主观化的产物,反问句都带有感情色彩。反问句的感情色彩来源于反问句独特的产生机制。说话人对 $p$ 的推断, $p$ 与 $q$ 的反蕴涵关系的构建,对 $p$ 的否定态度,都是说话人主观意识的反映,都反映了说话人独特的对问题的认识和看问题的视角,因此,充满了说话人的感情。分析了情态动词和一些副词与反问句关联的理据:情态意义的主观性和前提性与反问句的使用条件吻合;副词“还”或明或暗地含有“不该”义,与反问语气吻合。

本书区分“语用含义”、“语用功能”、“语用价值”这一组概念。认为反问句的语用含义是“某言论行为是不合理的”。由于反问句的推理具有逻辑性,所以反问比陈述更有力量。反问句隐涵义的推导遵循“适可而止”的原则。反问句的核心语用功能不是强调、辩驳、怨责,而是否定。最重要的衍生功能是辩驳,次重要的衍生功能是怨责、提醒、惊异困惑、劝说;辅助性功能有鄙夷嘲讽、感叹无奈、强调应答等。反问句功能衍生的规律是:功能衍生是以核心功能和语用含义为基础的,是从核心功能和语用含义中衍生出来的。衍生功能与核心功能、语用含义相关程度越高的反问句,在整个反问句中所占的比例也越高;衍生功能与核心功能、语用含义相关程度越低的反问句,在整个反问句中所占的比例也越低;衍生功能所受到的限制条件越多的反问句,在整个反问句中所占的比例越低。反问句的语用价值可以概括为诱导性、隐涵性、含义与功能的多样性、对面子的威胁性和不礼貌性。

最后分析了“谁让我小呢?”之类的“谁让”反问句和“S不是VP吗?”“S不是NP吗?”即所谓的“不是……吗?”反问句。前者不能按正常反问句理解为“没人(谁也没)让我小”,其主要功能是释因,使用在出现了不利情况的语境中,为不利情况寻找原因。它经历了主动词“去操纵化”过程,免除了“谁”的责任,从而使得谓宾小句对于不利情况具有摆脱不了的责任。后者基本语用含义是某行为不合情理,提醒功能的有无与强弱取决于说话人是否认定“SVP”“S是NP”所表达的内容是确定无疑的事实。提醒是这个格式在特定的语义语用条件下才具有的语用功能,对语境具有依赖性,而不是这个格式固有的语法意义。“不是”并非反问语气副词,而是引述性否定标记,否定一个论断。与“不”“没(有)”否定真值条件不同,“不是”还经常用来否定适宜条件。

## Abstract

This paper makes a systematic and comprehensive description of phonetic and syntactic features of Contemporary Chinese rhetorical question. On the basis of Conversational Implicature Theory, Neo-Gricean Conversational Implicature Theory, Speech Act Theory, Indirect Speech Act Theory, Relevance Theory and Logic Inference, the paper proposes semantic and pragmatic conditions for using the rhetorical question, constructs generative model hypothesis of the rhetorical question, tests the hypothesis with linguistic facts, and then uses the model to make reasonable explanations on syntax, semantics and pragmatics of the rhetorical question.

On the basis of thorough description, the paper makes an exhaustive induction of 37 types of rhetorical questions and presents the special tone type: extra high tone and high falling tone. Stress patterns of rhetorical questions are also summarized in a systematic way. In specially-referred rhetorical question, the interrogative words such as “什么”, “怎么”, “哪”, “哪儿” don't often carry stress. If they do, contrastive stress is more likely to be expected; some elements in rhetorical question often show contrastive stress; if there are no contrastive items in rhetorical question, the modifiers such as adverbs used before the verbs and modal verbs often have contrastive stress; the elements as “有”, “是”, “这”, “那” in the rhetorical question often have contrastive stress.

Generative model hypothesis of rhetorical question possesses four semantic and pragmatic conditions and their processing.

Behavioral condition: There exists a speech or behavior  $q$  that the speaker of the rhetorical question considers to be wrong and intends to deny.

Relational condition: Since one can deny  $q$  by denying the prerequisite  $p$  of the other's behavior  $q$ , he should first find  $p$ . The speaker deduces  $p$  and constructs the reversely entailed relation of  $p$  and  $q$ :  $q$  comes only after  $p$  and  $p$  reversely entails  $q$ . So, if  $p$  is false,  $q$  is unacceptable.

Substantial condition: Using the form of rhetorical rhythm and sentential form which restricts the listener to understand the discourse as the speaker expects, the speaker uses the rhetorical question to question on  $p$ .

Mood condition: The speaker considers that context does not support  $p$ ; since  $p$  is false,  $q$  is unacceptable.

The paper holds that rhetorical question is one type of interrogative sentences. Using interrogative device to express semantic content that is contrary to the proposition, the rhetorical question questions on the inferred prerequisite of certain speech or behavior, making the prerequisite of the speech or behavior be false and thus denying the speech or behavior. Though the speaker of the rhetorical question has no doubt at all, his question on the prerequisite of the other's speech is true question. To question on the prerequisite of the speech or behavior is one of the essential attributes of the rhetorical question that differentiates it from all the other interrogative sentences. The prerequisite of the speech or behavior which the speaker deduces involves three reasoning forms: sufficient conditional hypothetical reasoning, necessary conditional hypothetical reasoning and abductive reasoning. The abductive reasoning is the main reasoning form that the speaker takes. The paper establishes three rules to determine the rhetorical question: semantic rule of negation plus proposition, pragmatic rule of questioning on the prerequisite of the speech or behavior and formal rule of being able to answer.

The paper holds that the negative meaning of the rhetorical question



comes from mood condition, i.e. rhetorical mood. Rhetorical mood expresses the speaker's subjectively negative attitude to the proposition of the sentence through grammatical forms. The negative meaning of the specially-referred rhetorical question comes from three channels: The person, object and reason which are replaced by interrogative pronouns, according to the speaker, do not exist in context; the speaker thinks that the referents of interrogative pronouns are entirely different from or contrary to the receiver's comprehension of the referents of interrogative pronouns; the speaker, having a criterion on certain object or behavior in his mind and setting in advance that the object or behavior fails to reach the criterion, deliberately questions on the object or behavior in order to show that it doesn't fit the criterion and thus produces the negative meaning. The negative meaning of yes-or-no rhetorical question comes directly from the speaker's subjectively negative attitude. The rhetorical question has a variety of negative meanings that can be manifested in both literal meaning and pragmatic implicature. The negation of the rhetorical question is at semantic-pragmatic level and value level rather than syntax level. It is a question in which the value judgment is conveyed. The rhetorical question has subjectivity: its negation is subjective;  $p$  is the outcome of subjectivism; all rhetorical questions have emotional coloring that comes from the unique generative model of rhetorical question. The speaker's deduction of  $p$ , the constructing of the reversely entailed relation of  $p$  and  $q$ , and the negative attitude of  $p$  are all reflection of the speaker's subjective consciousness. They reflect the speaker's particular understanding of the issue and the unique perspective taken with the speaker's passion. The paper analyzes the motivations of the relation between modal verbs or some adverbs and the rhetorical question. The subjectivity and prerequisite characteristic of the modality accord with the using condition of the rhetorical question. The adverb “还” accords with rhetorical mood for it has explicit or implicit meaning of “不该”.

The paper makes clear the concepts as pragmatic implicature, pragmatic function and pragmatic values. The pragmatic implicature of the rhetorical question is that certain speech and behavior is unreasonable. Since the reasoning of the rhetorical question is logical, the rhetorical question exerts more force than statement. The deduction of the rhetorical question's implicit connotation should follow the principle of "appropriateness". The core pragmatic function of the rhetorical question is not emphasis, refutation, resentment or reproach but negation. The most important derivative function is refutation, while the functions of minor importance are refutation, resentment, reminding, amazement, perplexity and persuasion. The complementary functions are despise, ridicule, exclamation, helplessness, emphasis and response. The rule of the rhetorical question's functional derivation is based on and derived from its core function and pragmatic implicature. The more relevant the derivation function is to the core function and pragmatic implicature, the higher proportion it has in the rhetorical question. The less relevant the derivation function is to the core function and pragmatic implicature, the lower proportion it has in the rhetorical question. Besides, the more restrictive conditions certain derivative function has, the lower proportion it has in the rhetorical question. The pragmatic value of the rhetorical question can be summarized as inductivity, implicitness, diversity of meaning and function, face threatening and impoliteness.

The paper finally analyzes the “谁让” type rhetorical question as in “谁让我小呢?” and “不是……吗?” type rhetorical question as in “S 不是 VP 吗?” and “S 不是 NP 吗?”. The former sentence can not be seen as a normal rhetorical question and thus understood as “没人(谁也没)让我小”. The main function of this kind of rhetorical question, which is used in context of adverse condition, is to make clear the cause, looking for the responsible person for the adverse condition. It experiences the process of "de-manipulation" of the head verb and exempts “谁” from its responsi-

bility, making the predicate-object clause fail to break away from its responsibility to the adverse condition. The basic pragmatic implicature of the latter sentence is that certain behavior is not reasonable. The existence and strength of the reminding function depends on whether the speaker admits that the content expressed by “SVP” and “S 是 NP” is truth or not. It should be noted that the reminding function of the sentence pattern exists only under particular semantic and pragmatic condition and relies on the context, so it is not the inherent grammatical meaning of the sentence pattern. “不是” is not a rhetorical mood adverb, but a negation mark as premise, to deny a judgment. Different from “不”“没有” which denies the truth condition, “不是” is often used to deny suitable conditions as well.

## 序

反问句研究是汉语语法研究和汉语修辞研究的传统题目之一,积累了相当丰富的研究文献,近年来又有数篇研究反问句的博士论文和数十篇硕士论文,在观察和描写的充分性、细致性上已达到相当的高度。但反问句中仍有许多问题没有弄清楚,甚至一些带有根本性的问题没有解决,如反问句的性质、否定语义的来源、语用功能、语用价值,等等,这些问题又是中小学语文教学和对外汉语教学中亟待解决的问题。而像反问句研究这样的传统题目,要做出新意来,应该说是很困难的。德明却迎难而上,知难而进,选择了这个具有挑战性的课题。2006年上半年,即在他读博的第二个学期,我们讨论他的毕业论文选题,他详细谈了他关于反问句问题的想法,我觉得他对反问句产生机制的思考已经很深入、很成熟,于是同意了他的选题。当年,他以“反问句的产生机制及相关问题研究”为题,申报教育部人文社会科学研究项目并获得立项,同时成为上海师范大学博士研究生科研创新课题。现在呈现在大家面前的这本书就是在他的博士学位论文《现代汉语反问句产生机制及相关问题研究》的基础上修改而成的。

本书在研究旨趣上的一个重要特点,就是侧重于对反问句的理论解释。作者能另辟蹊径,在描写的基础上,依托当代语用学理论,提出使用反问句的语义语用条件,构建反问句产生模式假设,用语言事实验证假设,再用这个模式对反问句句法、语义、语用等一系列问题作出统一的解释。这在反问句研究中是理论上的突破。

全书创新颇多,如:提出四个使用反问句的语义语用条件;构建反问句产生模式假设;重新界定反问句和反问语气;指出对言论或行

为的前提提问是反问句本质属性之一;确立判定反问句的三个规则:“否定+命题”的语义规则、对言论或行为的前提提问的语用规则和能够充当答语的形式规则;分析使用反问句的推理机制;论证反问句的主观性;指出反问句的感情色彩来源于反问句独特的产生机制;分析情态动词和一些副词与反问句关联的理据;揭示反问句功能衍生的规律;将反问句的语用价值概括为诱导性、隐涵性、含义与功能的多样性、对面子的威胁性和不礼貌性,等等,在反问句的性质、范围、否定语义的来源、语用含义、语用功能、语用价值等等方面都提出了一系列新见解。尤其是“反问句产生模式”的构建是重要的理论创新。不仅如此,文章还揭示了许多新的语言事实。比如,穷尽地归纳了反问句特有格式 37 种;提出反问句特有的语调类型:特高调和升降调;系统总结了反问句的重音模式,等等。真可谓新意迭出。

理论方法上,本书主要运用会话含义和新格赖斯会话含义理论、言语行为和间接言语行为理论、关联理论以及逻辑学中的推理,做到了理论联系实际;注重归纳与演绎相结合、描写与解释相结合、静态分析与动态分析相结合,强调形式验证。

总之,我个人认为本书在汉语反问句的研究上取得了诸多突破,使汉语反问句研究迈向了一个崭新的高度。相信阅读了本书的读者方家也一定会赞同这一看法的。

我一向觉得为人、做事、为学都要实实在在,我也经常跟同学们说,要老老实实做人,勤勤恳恳做事,踏踏实实为学。德明的为人、做事就如同他做学问一样实在。当今之世,浮躁之气甚嚣尘上,能够心无旁骛、兀兀穷年专注于学问已属难能可贵。据我所知,德明在读博之前就写过反问句的论文,这样算来,他在反问句这块园地已经踏踏实实耕耘了六七年了。他能取得这样的成绩实在是“功夫不负有心人”。

2005 年 9 月德明来上海师范大学攻读博士学位,其实那时的德明学问上已经小有成绩,因而三年来,我和他亦师亦友,经常切磋交流,我也时常到他们宿舍聊天,常有“奇文共欣赏,疑义相与析”的愉快之感。不仅如此,德明还起到了大师兄的作用,他的学识、品德、作

风以及对同学的关爱,深深地影响了学弟和学妹。读博期间和毕业后不久,德明围绕反问句和芜湖方言语法,在《中国语文》、《方言》、《世界汉语教学》等刊物上发表了多篇高质量的论文,并申请成功和完成了教育部课题,成为了大家的“楷模”,至今在我的周围还有德明的许多“粉丝”呢。

我衷心地希望德明继续保持求实创新的精神,看到他更多的扎实创新的研究成果问世。

是为序。

陈昌来

2009年9月15日

# 目 录

序 .....	陈昌来
绪 论 .....	1
0.1 研究的对象和意义 .....	1
0.2 理论背景和研究方法 .....	3
0.3 语料说明 .....	4
0.4 术语、符号 .....	5
第一章 反问句研究的历史、现状与本书基本观点 .....	7
1.1 反问句研究回顾 .....	7
1.2 存在的问题 .....	37
1.3 本书对反问句的基本看法 .....	51
本章小结 .....	67
第二章 反问句的形式特征 .....	69
2.1 特指型反问句 .....	70
2.2 是非型反问句 .....	85
2.3 正反型和选择型反问句 .....	93
2.4 反问特有的格式 .....	96
2.5 反问句的韵律特征 .....	108
本章小结 .....	128

第三章 反问句的产生机制假设 .....	129
3.1 反问句使用条件的讨论 .....	129
3.2 反问句产生模式假设 .....	134
3.3 产生模式的验证 .....	139
3.4 q 的表现形式 .....	157
3.5 关系条件与逻辑推理 .....	165
本章小结 .....	177
第四章 反问句否定语义的来源及其性质 .....	179
4.1 前人对反问句否定语义来源的研究 .....	179
4.2 反问句否定语义的来源 .....	182
4.3 反问句否定语义的性质 .....	192
4.4 关于反问句的主观性 .....	199
本章小结 .....	205
第五章 反问触发语与反问句关联的理据:	
对产生模式的进一步证明 .....	206
5.1 否定词与反问句关联的理据 .....	206
5.2 情态动词与反问句关联的理据 .....	224
5.3 副词“还”与反问句关联的理据 .....	243
5.4 “就”与反问句关联的理据 .....	258
本章小结 .....	265
第六章 反问句的语用含义、语用功能和语用价值 .....	267
6.1 学术界对反问句语用问题的研究 .....	267
6.2 区别一组概念:语用含义、语用功能、语用价值 .....	272
6.3 语用含义 .....	277
6.4 语用功能 .....	288
6.5 语用价值 .....	309
本章小结 .....	325



---

第七章 两种特殊的反问句 .....	327
7.1 “谁让”问句 .....	327
7.2 “不是……吗”反问句及“不是”的性质和语义 .....	345
本章小结 .....	357
参考文献 .....	359
致 谢 .....	381