Non-standard Questions: Polarity and Contrast*

Suk-Jin Chang

1. Introduction

In this paper I will explicate the speech acts of rhetorical and echo questions, and 'rhechorical' questions, as illustrated in the dialogue exchange between Speakers A and B in (1): (1b) is a rhetorical question; (1c) is a 'rhechorical' question.

(1) a. A: Mia-ka Chelswu-lul an cohahay. Hia-to kulay.[1]
       'Mia doesn't like Chelswu. Hia doesn't, either.'

   b. B: Nwukwu-nun Chelswu-lul cohahay?
       'Who (ever) likes Chelswu?'

   c. A: Nwukwu-nun Chelswu-lul cohahanunya ko?
       'Who (ever) likes Chelswu?'

   d. B: Kulem, ney-ka cohahanun kuna.
       'Then, you like him.'

Rhetorical and echo questions are both well-known speech acts common to many languages including Korean and Japanese. I will take up rhetorical questions in Section 2, echo questions in Section 3, and rhechorical questions in Section 4. Expositions of the subject matter will center around Korean with occasional reference to Japanese and English. Before moving on to the discussion of these non-standard questions, it will be in order to observe some basic facets of standard questions as an introductory remark.

Two kinds of interrogatives have been recognized widely: (a) yes-or-no questions (YNQ, hereafter) and (b) wh-questions (WHQ, hereafter). The YNQ can be described as a special class of alternative questions or it can be treated and analyzed as a special case of the WHQ.[2]

Formal devices by which interrogatives are formed in contrast to declaratives, include

---

* I would like to dedicate this paper, fragmentary as it is, to my teacher Professor Hwang Chan-Ho on his 60th birthday, who has been the never ceasing source of reminding me of how one can stay rejuvenated physically and mentally, in doing and thinking, and in living as a whole.

[1] The Korean romanization used here is that of S. Martin's Yale Romanization.

[2] See Bolinger (1978) for a discussion that yes-no questions are not alternative questions. Various terms are used for yes-no questions: close, polar, propositional, restricted, or nexus questions. Wh-questions are also called non-restricted or x-questions.

157

(a) intonation (such as rising terminal contour), (b) interrogative words (such as wh-words or interrogative particles), and (c) word order. In Korean and Japanese, word order plays no role in forming interrogatives, while in English it has a distinctive role.

The main function of interrogatives is to perform a speech act of requesting information; in contrast, that of imperatives is to perform a speech act of requesting (non-verbal) action. The interrogatives and imperatives are thus viewed as belonging to the same class of speech acts, namely the request class, the former being a special case of the latter.[3]

2. Rhetorical Questions.

What has traditionally been called a rhetorical question is a question in form but a statement in function. A positive YNQ functions as a strong negative assertion; a negative YNQ as a strong positive assertion. A WHQ, when used as a rhetorical question, gives the effect of a strong negation. Let us consider the rhetorical-question readings of (2) and (3).[4]

(2) Mia-ka tolawa yo? (→Mia-nun an tolawa yo.)

'Is Mia coming back?' (→'Mia is not coming back.')

(3) Nwuka tolawa yo? (→Amu-to an tolawa yo.)

'Who is coming back?' (→'Nobody is coming back.')

---

[3] Two kinds of questions are generally recognized: (a) real questions and (b) exam questions (cf. Searle, 1969:66). In real questions the speaker wants to know the answer; in exam questions the speaker wants to know if the hearer knows the answer. Hintikka(1976) distinguishes these two kinds of questions by using different imperative/optative operators in his semantic representation of questions. For example, he assigns to a WHQ like (i) *Who lives here?* the imperative operator *Bring it about that* for its real question reading, and another operator *Tell me whether* (and a subsequent change of *I know* to *you know* in the 'desideratum') for its exam question reading. The two readings are representable as something like

(ii) Bring it about that Vx I know that x lives here.

(iii) Tell me whether Vx you know that x lives here.

According to Hintikka, WHQs like (i) are systematically ambiguous between an 'existential' reading (such as (ii) and (iii)) and a 'universal' reading (such as (iv) and (v) below).

(iv) Bring it about that Λx I know that x lives here.

(v) Tell me whether Λx you know that x lives here.

See Hausser (1980:78) for the semantic account of Hintikka (1976). In this paper I will not distinguish the existential and universal readings. I will use speech act-oriented paraphrases: 'I request you to tell me whether Vx(...x...)', for ordinary questions; 'I tell you whether Vx(...x...) & I know ¬Vx(...x...)' for rhetorical questions (cf. Chang, 1973).

[4] For my earlier treatment of the rhetorical questions, see Chang (1973:115-7), where I analyzed the semantic structure of the rhetorical question (i) as something like (ii), which consists of two conjuncts: one containing an indirect question and one containing the epystemic predicate *know* and a polarity opposite assertion.

(i) John-i onunya? 'Is John coming?'

(ii) TELL(a, b, OR(DO(John, COME(John)))) ∧ KNOW(a, NEG(DO(John, COME(John))))

In my earlier work (Chang, 1973) I also set up another type of questions called 'queclarative', which is not distinct from the rhetorical question except that the speech act of its first conjunct is a request for information, as in the ordinary question.

As a normal question the YNQ in (2) may be represented semantically as something like (4a) and its rhetorical question reading as something like (4b).

(4) a. (Normal question reading)

Tell me whether $\underbrace{\text{(Mia is coming back)}}_{p}$ v $\underbrace{\neg\text{(Mia is coming back)}}_{p}$

b. (Rhetorical question reading)

I tell you whether I know that p v I know that $\neg$p $\wedge$ I know that $\neg$p.

Notice that in the structure of (4b) the polarity-opposite assertion is performed by negating the first conjunct p in (p v $\neg$p). So the negative YNQ in (5a) may be semantically represented (for its rhetorical question reading) as in (5b).

(5) a. Mia-ka an tolawa yo? ($\rightarrow$Mia-nun tolawa yo.)

'Is Mia not coming back?' ($\rightarrow$'Mia is coming back.')

b. I tell you whether I know that $\neg$p v I know that p $\wedge$ I know that $\neg\neg$p$\equiv$ I know that p.

(where p=Mia is coming back.)

In the WHQ of (3) the questioned word *nwuka* ('who') can be described as a variable x, ranging over persons and bound by the existential quantifier, Vx. The normal WHQ reading of (3) can be represented as (6a) and its rhetorical question reading, which is the negation of the 'presupposition of a question', as (6b).

(6) a. (Normal WHQ reading)

Tell me whether (x_1 is coming back) v (x_2 is coming back) v

...v (x_n is coming back).

$\Rightarrow$Tell me whether Vx (x is coming back).

$\Rightarrow$Tell me x is coming backing.

$\Rightarrow$Tell me who is coming back.

$\Rightarrow$Who is coming back?

b. (Rhetorical question reading)

I tell you whether (x_1 is coming back) v (x_2 is coming back)v

...v (x_n is coming back) $\wedge$ I know that $\neg$p.

$\Rightarrow$I tell you whether Vx (x is coming back) $\wedge$ I know that

$\neg$Vx(x is coming back).

$\Rightarrow$I tell you x is coming back $\wedge$ I know that it is not the case that x is coming back.

$\Rightarrow$I tell you who is coming back $\wedge$ I know nobody is coming back.

$\Rightarrow$Who is coming back?—Nobody is coming back.

Notice that the negative assertion effected by the rhetorical WHQ in (3) contains the inclusive/conjunctive particle *to* as in *amu-to* (or *nwukwu-to*), which is repeated here as (7).

(7) Amu/nwukwu-to an tolawa yo. (cf. (3))

    'Nobody is coming back.'

The use of the inclusive/conjunctive particle *to* can be accounted for by converting the existential quantification in (6b) to a universal quantification, as illustrated in (8).

(8) I tell you whether Vx (x is coming back) $\wedge$ I know that $\neg Vx$ (x is coming back).

    $\Rightarrow ...\wedge$ I know that $\wedge x \neg$(x is coming back).

    $\Rightarrow ...\wedge$ I know that $\neg (x_1$ is coming back) $\wedge \neg (x_2$ is coming back)

    $...\wedge \neg (x_n$ is coming back).

In Korean the particle *to*, as illustrated in (8), semantically corresponds to the logical operator $\wedge$; in English there is no such counterpart. In Japanese the particle *mo* functions exactly like the Korean particle *to* in rhetorical WHQs, as shown in (9).

(9) Dare-ga kaette kimasu ka? (→Dare-*mo* kaette kimasen.)

    'Who is coming back?'   (→'Nobody is coming back.')

I will now look into an interesting problem of WHQs involving the thematic/contrastive particle *nun*.[5] The questioned word in an ordinary WHQ cannot be marked by the thematic *nun*. This is the case in Japanese, too. However, as we already saw in (1) and as we will see in (10), the same particle *nun* can mark questioned words in rhetorical WHQs; that is to say the questioned word marked by *nun* blocks an ordinary WHQ reading and gives rise to a rhetorical reading.

(10) a. Nwukwu-*nun* tolawa yo? (→Amu-to an tolawa yo.)

      'Who (ever) is coming back?' (→ 'Nobody is coming back.')

   b. Mia-ka mwes-*un* hal cwul ala yo? (→Mia-nun amukes-to hal cwul molla yo.)

      'What (ever) can Mia do? (→'Mia cannot do anything.')

   c. Tangsin-i encey-*nun* ilccik tolawasse yo? (→Tangsin-un ilccik tolaon cek-i

      epse yo.)

      'When (ever) did you come home early?' (→'You never came home early.')

   d. Mia-ka eti-*nun* an kana yo? (→Mia-nun‚amu tey-na ka yo.)

      'Where (ever) doesn't Mia go? (Lit.) (→'Mia goes everywhere.')

Interestingly enough, however, this use of the thematic/contrastive particle is not permitted in Japanese. So those in (11), in which the interrogative words marked by *wa*, are all ill-formed.

(11) a. *Dare-*wa* kaette kimasu ka?

---

[5] Kuno's(1973) explication of the Japaness particles *wa* and *ga* is applicable to the Korean counterparts *nun* and *ka*. The main functions of *wa* are thematic and contrastive; those of *ga* are descriptive and exhaustive-listing. Terms 'theme' and 'topic' are often used interchangeably, although some linguists like Dik (1978) keep them apart.

'Who (ever) is coming back?'

b. *Mia-ga nani-*wa* dekimasu ka?

'What (ever) can Mia do?'

c. *Anata-ga itu-*wa* hayaku kaette kimasita ka?

'When (ever) did you come home early?'

d. *Mia-ga dokoe-*wa* ikimasen ka?

'Where (ever) doesn't Mia go? (Lit.)'

Since one of the two main functions of the particle *nun*, as explicated by Kuno (1973), is thematic, it marks an anaphoric element of a sentence, which conveys given information. The questioned element cannot be marked by the *thematic* particle *nun* in an ordinary WHQ. However, the contrastive use of *nun* will give rise to rhetorical reading. So it is the contrastive function of the particle *nun* that allows rhetorical question readings in (1) and (10). Such a use is not permitted in Japnese[6]. What makes those Japanese sentences in (11) ungrammatical is not a matter of semantics but that of syntax in Japanese.

Contrastiveness of the questioned NP marked by *nun* in a rhetorical WHQ will be made clear when we consider the first part of the dialogue exchange in (1), which is repeated here as (12) for ease of reference.

(12) a. A: Mia-ka Chelswu-lul an cohahay. Hia-to kulay.

'Mia doesn't like Chelswu. Hia doesn't, either.'

b. B: Nwukwu-nun Chelswu-lul cohahay?

'Who (ever) likes Chelswu?' (→'Nobody likes him.')

Nwuku-nun ('who') in (12b) is contrasted to *Mia* and *Hia* in (12a). Without A's mention, namely 'Mia doesn't like Chelswu. Hia doesn't like him, either.', where someone like Mia and Hia is mentioned, the use of *nwukwu-nun* by Speaker B would be inappropriate. Suppose there are six persons in the domain of discourse: A, B, C, Mia, Hia, and Chelswu. Then, *nwukwu-nun* in (12b) refers to three persons, A, B, and C.

Without anybody to contrast with, Speaker B may speak to A, using *nwu-ka* as in (13).

(13) a. A: ⋯

b. B: Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul cohahay?

'Who likes Chelswu?' (→'Nobody likes him.')

---

[6] Constructions like (i), in which the wh-words marked by *nun* (or *wa*) are used constrastively, are grammatical in both Korean and Japanese.

(i) (K) Nwukwu-nun naccam-ul cako, nwukwu-nun yelsim-hi il-ul hanta-nun kes-un pulkong-pyenghata.

(J) Dare-wa hirune-o si, dare-wa nessin-ni hatarakuto-wa hukoohei-da.

(E) Somebody takes a nap and somebody works hard—that's not fair.

Note that the English rendition wouldn't naturally contain the wh-word *who*.

The rhetorical question in (13b), which contains the subject marker *ka*, not the contrastive marker *nun*, has the same effect as (12b) in that nobody likes Chelwu. However, those referred to by *nwuka* in (13b) may or may not be the same as those referred to by *nwukwu-nun*; in (13b), any subset of {A, B, C, Mia, Hia} can be the value of *nwuka*. B's rhetorical question may continue as in (14), those who don't like Chelswu are exhaustively listed one by one in the form of rhetorical YNQs.

(14) a. A: ...

　　 b. B: Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul cohahay? Nanun cohahaciman. Mia-ka cohahay? Hia-ka cohahay? C-ka cohahay? Ney-ka cohahay? Na-pakkeyn amu-to an cohahay. 'Who likes Chelswu? I like him, though. Does Mia like him? Does Hia like him? Does C like him? Do you like him? Nobody likes him except me.''

The rhetorical questions does not assume a dialogue context. The particular type of WHQs marked with *nun*, however, assumes previous discourse as we witnessed in (1). The rhetorical YNQ is an indirect speech act of polarity-opposite assertion; the rhetorical WHQ is that of negating the presupposition of a question.

3. Echo Questions

In a dialogue one speaker may repeat as a whole or in part what another speaker said as a request for repetition or confirmation, or as a showing of politeness or concern or as an expression of surprise, disbelief or the like. This type of speech acts has been called echo questions. Such repetitive utterances made in response to echo questions I called echo statements elsewhere (Chang, 1973; 1981).

Syntactically, there are two types of echo questions in Korean: (a) the echo question with the complementizer *ko* and (b) the echo question without the complementizer. The former is the dominant type, the latter being very much restricted in distribution. The echo questions with the complementizer/quatative *ko* are in the from of indirect questions. This is the general pattern of echo questions prevailing in many languages.[7]

---

[7] In this respect English seems to belong to an exceptional class of languages in that it makes use of the same form in echo questions as in direct questions. However, Chauser inserted the complementizer *that* in echo questions as in other clauses; from the time of Shakespeare English simply repeated the question unchanged (except for the tone) (Jespersen, 1924:304). The following illustration, part of which is taken from Jespersen (1924:304), may support the view that the form of indirect questions is used for echo questions.

(i) YNQ

	Normal Questions	Echo Questions
Korean	Cengmal-i ya?	Cengmal-inya ko?
Japanese	Hontoo ka?	Hontoo ka tte?
English	Is that true?	Is that true?
French	Est-ce que c-est vrai?	Si c'est vrai?
	(Est ce vrai?)	
German	Ist das wahr?	Ob das wahr ist?

Phonologically, the echo questions can be characterized as marked by non-falling termi-nal contours, which can further be distinguished in three ways: (a) rising, (b) sustaining, and (c) high-rising (cf. Chang, 1981). We will come back to this intonational distinction when we discuss the speech acts performed in the echo qustions.

Let us now compare the two types of echo questions in Korean, the *ko* echo questions and the zero-echo questions, in the dialogue context of (15)-(17). (# indicates that the utterance is inappropriate, as not interpretable as an echo question.)

(15) a. A: Ecey Mia-lul mannassta.

'I met Mia yesterday.'

B: {
Ecey Mia-lul mannassta ko? (*ko*-echo Q)

Ecey Mia-lul mannass {
e (yo)? (zero-echo Q)
#nya?
#upnikka?
}
}

'Did you meet Mia yesterday?'

(16) a. A: Mia-lul mannassni?

'Did you meet Mia?'

B: {
Mia-lul mannassnunya ko? (*ko*-echo Q)
#Mia-lul mannasse (yo)?
}

'Did I meet Mia?'

b. A: Mia-lul mannala!

'Meet Mia!'

B: {
Mia-lul mannala ko? (*ko*-echo Q)
#Mia-lul mannala?
}

'Meet Mia?'

c. A: Mia-lul mannaca!

'Let's meet Mia!'

B: {
Mia-lul mannaca ko? (*ko*-echo Q)
#Mia-lul mannaca?
}

'Let's meet Mia?'

Examples in (15) and (16) show that the zero-echo question can be used only in response to a statement, restricted to the *hay* (*yo*) (i.e. 'intimate') speech level, whereas the *ko*-echo question has no such restriction, as it is free to occur in response to any of the major

---

	Danish	Er det sandt?	Om det er sandt?
(ii)	WHQ		
	Korean	Ne-nun mwel hayssnya?	Nay-ka mwel hayssnunya ko?
	Japanese	Kimi-wa nani-o sita ka?	Boku-ga nani-o sitaka tte?
	English	What have you done?	What have I done?
	French	Que avez vous fait?	Ce que j'ai fait?
	German	Was hast du getan?	Was Ich getan habe?
	Danish	Hvad har du gjort?	Hvad jeg har gjort?

sentence types: declaratives (15a), interrogatives (16a), imperatives (16b) and propositives (16c). These sentence types can be constructed with the complementizer *ko* to form an indirect discourse.

In Japanese, the echo questions are marked by the sentence final *tte*, contraction of the complementizer *to* and *itte*, the past tense form of *iu* ('say'). Consider the examples in (17)

(17) a. A: Kinoo Mia-ni atta. (cf. 15a)
'I met Mia yesterday.'
B: Kinoo Mia-ni atta tte?
'You met Mia yesterday?'

b. A: Mia-ni atta ka? (cf. 16a)
'Did you meet Mia?'
B: Mia-ni attaka tte?
'Did I meet Mia?'

c. A: Mia-ni ae! (cf. 16b)
'Meet Mia!'
B: Mia-ni ae tte?
'Meet Mia?'

d. A: Mia-ni aoo! (cf. 16c)
'Let's meet Mia!'
B: Mia-ni aoo tte?
'Let's meet Mia?'

In Japanese, the sentence-final *to itte* is contracted to *tte*, the gerundive form dangling sentence-finally; in Korean, the verb of saying *hata* is suppressed, with the complementizer *ko* dangling sentence finally. Thus we observe that the echo questions are formed in a similar but not identical way in both languages, each manifesting its own syntactic behavior.

Consider now the way the polite speech level is marked in echo questions. In Korean, the polite marker *yo* is added to the complementizer *ko*, as shown in (18).

(18) A: Ecey Mia-lui mannassta. (=15a)
B: Ecey Mia-ul mannassta ko yo?
'You met Mia yesterday?'

In a complement clause no speech level other than the plain (*hayla*) speech level can be marked in Korean. So the sentences in (19B) are all ungrammatical.

(19) A: Ecey Mia-lul mannassta. (=18A)

B: *Ecey Mia-lul $\begin{cases} \text{mannassupnita ko?} \\ \text{mannasse yo ko?} \\ \text{mannasse ko?} \\ \text{mannassney ko?} \end{cases}$

'I met Mia yesterday'?

In Japanese, the polite speech level marked by *desu* or *masu* can occur in the complement clause before *tte*, as shown in (20B), although the polite speech level cannot be marked in an ordinary complement clause as in (21).

(20) A: Kinoo Mia-ni atta. (=17a)

'I met Mia yesterday.'

B: Kinoo Mia-ni aimasita tte?

'You met Mia yesterday?'

(21) John-ga Mia-ni $\begin{cases} \text{*aimasita} \\ \text{atta} \end{cases}$ to omoimasu.

'I think John met Mia.'

With respect to the marking of the polite speech level in the echo questions, Korean and Japanese show different syntactic behavior.

We will now look into the speech act of the echo questions. As I noted at the beginning of this section, the speech act of the echo quesions is not a request for information but request for repetition or confirmation, or a showing of politeness or concern or an expression of surprise, disbelief, or the like. I will now explicate these observations in relation with the intonational properties of the echo questions. I set up three distinctive levels of terminal contours for the echo questions: (a) rising, (b) sustaining, and (c) high-rising, as illustrated in (22).

(22) A: Ecey Mia-lul mannassta.

B: Mia-lul mannassta $\begin{cases} \text{ko? } \nearrow \text{(a)} \\ \text{ko? } \rightarrow \text{(b)} \\ \text{ko? } \uparrow \text{(c)} \end{cases}$

The illocutionary acts correlated with these three terminal contours are roughly represented as in (23).[8]

(23) In saying 'Did you say S,' $\begin{cases} \text{I request you to. } \begin{cases} \text{repeat S. (Rising)} \\ \text{confirm S. (Rising)} \end{cases} \\ \text{I repeat S.} \qquad\qquad\qquad \text{(Sustaining)} \\ \text{I indicate interest or concern in S. (Sustaining)} \\ \text{I express surprise or disbelief in S. (High-rising)} \end{cases}$

---

[8] I posited a performative-like structure 'Did you say S?' as the underlying semantic structure containing the echo question 'S?' (Chang, 1981). See Stockwell et al. (1973) for the analyses of echo utterances.

(where S='Mia-lul mannassta')

In response to an echo question with a rising tone, which I assume to be a request for repetition or confirmation, the interlocutor complies to it normally with 'yes', followed by repetition or confirmation. No verbal response is expected from the echo question with a sustaining tone or from the echo question with a high-rising tone. I have more to say about the echo question with a high-rising tone in the next section.

4. Rhechorical Questions

So far I have treated rhetorical questions and echo questions separately. I will now attempt to put them together as functionally similar and related under the dubbing of 'rhechorical' questions. I observed that the echo question with a high-rising tone conveys the speaker's surprise, disbelief, and the like.

I will first elaborate this speech act of expressing surprise or disbelief to relate with that of the rhetorical questions. The echo question with a high-rising tone, which Jespersen (1924:304) called 'question raised to the second power',[9] is a 'retorted' question in a sense. When the echo question with a high-rising tone is uttered in response to a statement, it conveys, among others, a strong sense of disbelief, expressible as something like 'It can't be that S (where S is the statement by his interlocutor)', thus implying the negation of the statement. This is a conversational implicature (à la Grice) and it can be cancelled accordingly. Consider (24), where Speaker B is responding to Speaker A's statement with a high-rising tone.

(24) a. A: Mia-lul mannassta.
         'I met Mia.'
      B: Mia-lul mannassta ko? ↑
         'You met Mia?'

B's echo question can be interpreted as meaning: 'It can't be!', 'I don't believe you.', 'It's surprising.', and the like. Speaker B can enforce his disbelief or negative attitude by saying something like (25)

(25) A: ...
     B: Mia-lul mannassta ko? Kulel li-ka issna?
        'You met Mia? How can it be?'

The added utterance is itself a rhetorical question, which asserts 'Kulel li-ka epsta.' ('It can't be.').

In the discussion of rhetorical questions, we observed that the speaker strongly negates the proposition made in a YNQ or the presupposition of a WHQ. The functional similarity

---

[9] Jespersen didn't use the term 'echo question'; instead, he called it a retorted question and a question raised to the second power.

between the echo questions 'raised to the second power' (with a high-rising tone) and the rhetorical questions lies in this attitude of the speaker: in the case of the echo questions, the speaker's polarity-opposite negation-oriented attitude is suggestive or suppositive, in the case of the rhetorical questions it is assertive.

When an echo question is made with a high-rising tone in response to a YNQ it conveys, among others a sense that the original question is superfluous and as such the speaker implicates either positive or negative assertion, depending on pragmatic factors. Consider (26), where Speaker B is responding to Speaker A's question with a high-rising tone.

(26) A: Mia-ka Chelswu-lul cohahay?
         'Does Mia like Chelswu?'
     B: Mia-ka Chelswu-lul cohahanunya ko? ↑
         'Mia likes Chelswu?'

Speaker B's echo question (with the proper intonation of high-rising) indicates that Speaker A's question is superfluous, as the answer is so obvious. What Speaker A thinks obvious, however, is open to both positive and negative polarities. So, Speaker B's echo question in (26) can be interpreted as asserting either (a) "Of course, yes." or (b) "Of course, not." In fact, Speaker B may continue as in (27).

(27) A: ...
     B: Mia-ka Chelswu-lul cohahanunya ko? { (a) Mullon-i ci.
                                             { (b) Chenman-ey.
        'Mia likes Chelswu? { (a) Of course, yes.'
                            { (b) Not at all.'

What makes the speaker implicate positive or negative polarity is entirely context-dependent, including the speaker's belief or knowledge of the world. Even with negative questions as in (28), what the speaker asserts can be interpreted either positively or negatively.

(28) A: Mia-ka Chelswu-lul an cohahay?
         'Doesn't Mia like Chelswu?'
     B: Mia-ka Chelawu-lul an cohahaunya ko? { (a) Mullon cohaha ci.
                                              { (b) Mullon an cohaha ci.
        'Doesn't Mia like Chelswu?'
        'Does Mia like Chelswu? { (a) Of course, he does.'
                               { (b) Of course, not.'

I will go back to the initial dialogue in (1), repeated here as (29), with focus on and Speaker B's rhetorical question (1b) and Speaker A's echo question to it (1c).

(29) (=1)

    a. A: Mia-ka Chelswu-lul an cohahay. Hia-to kulay.

        'Mia doesn't like Chelswu. Hia doesn't, either.'

    b. B: Nwukwu-nun Chelswu-lul cohahay?

        'Who (ever) likes Chelswu?'

    c. A: Nwukwu-nun Chelswu-lul cohahanunya ko? ↑

        'Who (ever) likes Chelswu?'

    d. B: Kulem, ney-ka cohahanun kuna.

        'Then, you like him.'

The rhetorical question (29b) asserts (30).

(30) B: Amu-to Chelswu-lul coha an hay.

      'Nobody likes Chelswu.'

And it cannot be cancelled, as shown in the contradictory statement in the second sentence of (31).[10]

(31) B: #Nwukwu-nun Chelswu-lul cohahay? Misun-i-ka cohaha ci.

      'Who (ever) likes Chelswu? Misun does.'

Speaker A's echo question (29c) is a response to Speaker B's rhetorical question (29b) and what is asserted by the rhetorical question is not cancelled. Accordingly, the echo question has also the effect of the rhetorical question, and it is carried on through the echo question. In (29c) we see the *interaction of a rhetorical question and an echo question*— a *rhechorical* question.

    Given the dialogue situation of (29), Speaker A may as well say to Speaker B as in (32).

(32) a. A: ...

    b. B: ...

    c. A: Amu-to Chelswu-lul coha an hanta ko?' ↑

        'Nobody likes Chelswu?'

    d. B: ...

Supppse Speaker A's rhechorical question (29c), which gives the effect of the echo question (32c), is made in a high-rising tone. Then, (32c) conveys, among others, a negative

---

[10] If *nwuka* replaces *nwukwu-nun* in (31), Misun is excluded from the domain of discourse and the sequence of utterances in (i) is acceptable; however, if *nwukwu-nun* is used in place of *nwuka* the sequence is unacceptable as indicated in (ii) with #.

    (i) Misun-i-ka Chelswu-lul cohahay. Kupakkey *nwu-ka* Chelswu-lul cohahay? Amu-to an cohaha ci. 'Misun likes Chelsu. Who else likes him? Nobody does.'

    (ii) # Misun-i-ka Chelswu-lul cohahay. Ku pakkey *nwukwu-nun* Chelswu-lul cohahay? Amu-to an cohaha ci.

assertion, which amounts to asserting (33) by way of a computation like (34).

    (33) Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul cohahay.
          'Somebody likes him.'

    (34) $\Lambda x\neg$ (x likes Chelswu)   (Amu/nwukwu-to Chelswu-lul an cohahay.)
                                       'Nobody likes Chelswu.'
       $\Rightarrow \neg\neg\Lambda x$ (x likes Chelswu)   (polarity-opposite assertion)
       $\Rightarrow Vx$ (x likes Chelswu)   (Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul cohahay.)
                                       'Somebody likes him.'

What Speaker A performs by the rhechorical question (29c) is then negate the effect of Speaker B's rhetorical question (29b), that is to say, undoing the rhetorical question. The rhechorical question, properly interpreted as illustrated above, may elicit Speaker B's response like (29d), which admits that somebody likes Chelswu. However, if Speaker A's echo question is made in a normal rising tone, which implies that Speaker A requests Speaker B to repeat or confirm what he said, then Speaker B would respond appropriately as in (35d), which is what I called 'echo statement' elsewhere (Chang, 1973; 1981).

    (35) a. A: ...
          b. B: ...
          c. A: Nwukwu-nun Chelswu-lul cohahanunya ko?
              'Who (ever) likes Chelswu?'
          d. B: Kulay, nwukwu-nun Chelswu-lul cohahanunya ko.
              'Yeah, who (ever) likes Chelswu.'

Notice that the exchange of (35c) and (35d) is not typical of the rhechorical question, since Speaker A's echo question is not 'raised to the second power' (à la Jespersen, 1924), which expresses the speaker's polarity-opposite assertion.

    The functional characteristic of the non-standard questions —the rethorical and echo question and their hybrid— rests in this polarity-opposite attitude of the speaker. The rhechorical questions are echo questions raised to the second power in response to the rhetorical questions.

REFERENCES

Bolinger, D. (1978) 'Yes-No Questions Are Not Alternative Questions,' in H. Hiz, ed., *Questions*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht.

Chang, Suk-Jin (1973) *A Generative Study of Discourse: Pragmatic Aspects of Korean with Reference to English, Language Research* 9. 2(Supplsement), Seoul National University.

———————— (1981) 'Repetitives in Korean,' *Mal* 6, 89-112, Yonsei University.

Dik, S. C. (1978) *Functional Grammar*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.

Hintikka, J. (1976) *The Semantics of Questions and the Questions of Semantics: Acta Philosophica Fennica* 28.4, North-Holland, Amsterdam.

Jespersen, O. (1924) *The Philosophy of Grammar*, Allen and Unwin, London.

Hausser, R. R. (1980) 'Surface Compositionality and the Semantics of Mood,' in J. R. Searle, F. Kiefer and M. Bierwisch, eds., *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*, 71-95, D. Reidel, Dordrecht.

Katz, J. J. and P. M. Postal (1964) *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

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

Stockwell, R., P. Schachter, and B. H. Partee, eds. (1973) *The Major Syntactic Structures of English*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Department of Linguistics
College of Humanities
Seoul National University
Kwanak-ku, Seoul 151
Korea