

Do rhetorical questions belong to the pragmatic wastebin?

Angelika Kiss
angelika.kiss@mail.utoronto.ca

University of Toronto

19 February 2021 / SURGE, Rutgers University



Introduction: Rhetorical questions

- (1) a. Who likes salty licorice?
- b. Does anyone like salty licorice?

- Both (1a) and (1b) can be pronounced as *YVg[˘ Vbr [˘ Xad Sf[a` ŽeWV[˘* Y questions (**ISQ**), or as rhetorical question (**RQ**).
- But what are rhetorical questions?

Rhetorical questions..

- don't require an answer
- are indirect assertions (Riemer, 2020)
- can be used for different pragmatic purposes
 - to highlight some fact
 - as a retort

(2) A: How reliable is she?

B: How shallow is the ocean? (Schaffer, 2005, (2))

to embarrass the addressee (Farkas and Roelofsen, 2017)

- ...and the list of these observation goes on.

Introduction: Rhetorical questions

The goal is to give an account of rhetorical questions from which the above properties can be derived.

- What are rhetorical questions?
 - Are they assertions?
 - Are they questions?
- What is the role of the context in interpreting rhetorical questions?
 - Does the addressee have to know the domain?
 - Does the addressee need to share a certain piece of information (common ground)?
- How do rhetorical questions sound?
 - How does their intonation contribute to their interpretation?
 - Do rhetorical questions share any prosodic features across languages?

Outline

- 1 Definitions of rhetorical questions
 - Rhetorical questions as negative assertions
 - Rhetorical questions as questions
- 2 Inquisitive semantics
 - Farkas and Roelofsen (2017)
 - Polar rhetorical questions
- 3 Rhetorical *wh*-questions
 - i* *Z*-interrogatives in inquisitive semantics
 - RQ_L vs. RQ
- 4 Support from prosody
 - Mandarin *i* *Z*-questions
 - Cantonese *i* *Z*-questions
- 5 Discussion
- 6 Conclusion

Introduction: Rhetorical questions

Negative / empty set rhetorical questions (**RQ**)

- (3) Context: Your friend would like to buy salty licorice for a movie night you're heading to. But you think it's a bad idea since your friends definitely don't like it. You say:
- (a) "Who likes salty licorice?"
 - (b) "Does anyone like salty licorice?"
 - (c) "Nobody likes salty licorice."

Positive / existential rhetorical questions (**RQL**)

- (4) Context: You and your friend both know that Ben is a big fan of salty licorice. Seeing a bag of salty licorice, your friend wonders who could have bought it. You think the answer is obviously Ben, so you say:
- (a) "Who likes salty licorice?"
 - (b) ??? "Does anyone like salty licorice?"
 - (c) "Ben likes salty licorice."

Introduction: Rhetorical questions

- (1)
 - a. Who likes salty licorice?
 - b. Does anyone like salty licorice?

RQs have various definitions:

- “Negative” assertions (Han, 2002)

On this view, (1a) and (1b) convey ‘Nobody likes salty licorice’

RQ only

The meaning of RQs is derived compositionally

- Questions with an already known/obvious answer (Rohde, 2006; Caponigro and Sprouse, 2007; Biezma and Rawlins, 2017)

On this view, the interpretation of (1a) and (1b) is determined by the common ground.

- a. Mary likes salty licorice (as we all know)
- b. Everyone likes salty licorice (as we all know)
- c. Nobody likes salty licorice (as we all know)
- d. ...

RQ or RQ_L

The meaning of RQs is pragmatically determined

Defining rhetorical questions

The **assertion-like** analysis of RQs can answer:

- Why do RQs pattern with assertions?
- (5) (a) 3 *WS*ⁿ; nobody cares about prosody.
(b) 3 *WS*ⁿ; who cares about prosody?
- How come minimizers are licensed in RQs (RQs)?
Wh-word/Q operator becomes a “negative quantifier”

Issues

- What about RQLs?
 - Why are RQs syntactically the same as information-seeking questions (ISQs)?
Multiple RQs “After all, who danced with who first?”
Embedded RQs “Should I even ask, who would give a damn if I stopped coming to work?”
(Caponigro and Sprouse, 2007)
 - Why can RQs be answered the same way as ISQs and not as assertions?
- (6) (a) A: Who likes salty licorice? (as a RQ)
B: Nobody. / #Yes. / #No.
(b) A: Nobody likes salty licorice.
B: #Nobody. / Yes. / No.

Defining rhetorical questions

The **question-like** analysis of RQs can answer:

- RQLs are not ignored.
- Why are RQs syntactically the same as ISQs?
- Why can RQs be answered the same way as ISQs and not as assertions?

Issues = Strengths of the assertion-like account

- Why do RQs pattern with assertions?
- How come minimizers are licensed in RQs?

Proposal

- It is possible to combine the strengths of both approaches in an inquisitive semantic account.
- The meaning of RQs is neither entirely compositional, nor entirely pragmatically determined.

Defining rhetorical questions

An implicit assumption of Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) and Biezma and Rawlins (2017):

- I challenge this assumption, similarly to Jamieson (2018)
- **RQ_L**: a non-empty subset of the Hamblin-set
To arrive at the intended interpretation of RQ_Ls, the hearer needs to rely on the common ground.
“pragmatic rhetorical / Z-questions” (Jamieson, 2018)
- **RQ** : the complement of the Hamblin-set
To interpret RQ s, no contextual information is needed.
Jamieson (2018): “generic rhetorical questions”

Inquisitive semantics

Inquisitive semantics models both the inquisitive and the informative content of an expression.

- Inquisitive content: a set of ~~SFV~~ ~~SfThV~~ maximal elements of partially ordered sets of information states (nodes {a}, {b} and {c})
 - Trivial: at most one alternative
 - Non-trivial: more than one alternatives
- Informative content: a set of possible worlds
 - Trivial:
 - Non-trivial: a proper subset of
- IS is ideal for biased questions, which have both a non-trivial inquisitive content and a non-trivial informative content
 - They raise an issue
 - They also commit the speaker

Inquisitive semantics

- Farkas & Roelofsen (2017)'s “division of labor” account extended to accommodate *i* Z-interrogatives
- **Basic discourse context**

PARTICIPANTS: a set of individuals

TABLE: a stack of issues (Farkas and Bruce, 2010)

COMMITMENTS: a function that maps every participant onto a set of possibilities to which they are publicly committed.

W : a set of possible worlds compatible with a participant's commitments
: common ground: derived from participants' commitment sets.

Inquisitive semantics

An expression α , whether it is a declarative or interrogative sentence, is subject to the same interpretation process.

(7) Basic conventions of use

If a discourse participant J utters a declarative or interrogative sentence α , the discourse context is affected as follows:

- (a) The proposition expressed by α , $J \models \alpha$, is added to the TABLE.
- (b) The informative content of α , $\text{info}(J \models \alpha)$ is added to COMMITMENTS(α)

(8) Special discourse effects

Sentence-final intonation marks (in English) whether and how the basic interpretation of an expression is overridden by different levels of credence in the highlighted alternative.

- zero to low credence,
- moderate to high credence,
- high credence

Inquisitive semantics

Highlighted alternatives

- A polar interrogative has two alternatives: $\{ \cdot, \neg \}$
- One of the two alternatives has a special status: the ~~Z~~ ~~YZ~~ ~~$\uparrow YZ$~~ ~~W~~ ~~S~~ ~~$\uparrow W$~~ ~~S~~ ~~$\uparrow S$~~ ~~h~~ ~~h~~ , which is the proposition conveyed by the sentence radical introduces a propositional discourse referent

(9) A: Does Ben like salty licorice?

B1: I don't think \emptyset = 'Ben likes salty licorice'

B2: Yes. / No. = 'Ben likes salty licorice'

- EVIDENCE: a function that maps commitments to intervals of credence levels. For example:
 - Incredulity towards : \cdot , [zero, low]
 - Uncertainty regarding : \cdot , [low, moderate]
 - Certainty in : \cdot , [high]

Inquisitive semantics

(10) Assertions, $\text{info}(\varphi) = \{ \varphi \}$

- i. Basic conventional discourse effects
 - a. φ is added to the TABLE
 - b. $\text{info}(\varphi)$ is added to $\text{COMMITMENTS}(\varphi)$
- ii. Special effects: n/a

(11) Polar questions, $\text{info}(\varphi) = \{ \varphi, \neg\varphi \}$

- i. Basic conventional discourse effects
 - a. $\{ \varphi, \neg\varphi \}$ is added to the TABLE
 - b. $\text{info}(\varphi) \cup \text{info}(\neg\varphi) = \{ \varphi, \neg\varphi \}$ is added to $\text{COMMITMENTS}(\varphi)$
- ii. Special effects: n/a

(12) Rising declaratives $\text{info}(\varphi) = \{ \varphi, \neg\varphi \}$

- i. Basic conventional discourse effects
 - a. $\{ \varphi, \neg\varphi \}$ is added to the TABLE
 - b. $\text{info}(\varphi) \cup \text{info}(\neg\varphi) = \{ \varphi, \neg\varphi \}$ is added to $\text{COMMITMENTS}(\varphi)$
- ii. Special effect: $\text{info}(\varphi)$, [zero, low] is added to $\text{EVIDENCE}(\varphi)$

Inquisitive semantics

Polar rhetorical questions

(1b) *6a* ~~W~~S` ka` W[] W~~S~~rk [Ubd]UW (RQ)

- Basic conventional discourse effects:

{ , \neg } is added to the TABLE

is added to COMMITMENTS()

- Special effect: Depends on prosody!

zero to low credence,

moderate to high credence,

high credence

- What do we know about the prosody of polar rhetorical questions in English?

A tendency to have a falling final tune (Banuazizi and Creswell, 1999; Dehé and Braun, 2019)

- If so: , [high] should be added to EVIDENCE()

- But a RQ expresses just the opposite, that , [zero] is added to EVIDENCE()

Inquisitive semantics - Summary

- In Farkas & Roelofsen's (2017) system, interrogatives and declaratives are interpreted by the same principle: their semantic content is put on the TABLE and their informative content updates the speaker's commitments.
- It aims at a systematic account of special effects, tying them to sentence-final tunes, in line with the theory of biological codes (Ohala, 1994; Gussenhoven, 2004)

Problems

- Polar RQs tend to have a falling final tune in English, contrary to what Farkas & Roelofsen's system would predict.
- Rising declaratives aren't necessarily incredulous and don't always rise (Geluykens, 1988; Poschmann, 2008)
- It is not straightforward how *i* Z-interrogatives fit, given that they don't have highlighted alternatives.

How do we assign credence levels?

How do we interpret sentence-final tunes?

Rhetorical / Z-questions

- / Z-interrogatives like (1a) do not have a highlighted alternative because they do not have a sentence radical.
- They have a $\text{cgv}[a] \text{cSV}[US^{\wedge}]$ (Krifka, 2017) which denotes a $Z[YZ \uparrow YZfW \text{bcab}Wk]$ (Farkas, 2020).
- The highlighted property applied pointwise to each member of the domain yields a Hamblin-set.
- $D = \{\text{Ann, Ben, Cecil}\}$
 $\text{---} = \{\text{'Ann likes salty licorice', 'Ben likes salty licorice', 'Cecil likes salty licorice'}\}$
 $\text{---} = \{\text{'Nobody likes salty licorice'}\}$

(13) The basic conventional discourse effects of a wh-interrogative in a domain D

- --- is added to the TABLE
- $\text{info}(\) \text{---} \text{info}(\) = \text{---}$ is added to COMMITMENTS()

3IFUP S X D B W F T U J P O T 4QFDJBM EJTDPVSTF

3IFUPSJDBM RVFTUJ POT IBWF UIF TBNF CBTJD EJTDPVST
BMTP IBWF TQFDJBM FkFDUT

4QFDJBM FkFDU PG 32T 5IF B O P K E F S J \$ B Q M P S O F J B H E S Z P H J O W E F
#JF[NB BOE 3BXMJOT

)PX UP JOUFSQSUFU B 32 MJLF B BTTVNJOH UIBU % \"

- B • %• JT BEEFE "U, P. UIF
- C • JT BEE F Ž Œ Œ % "œ ... • " ' "
- D • \$ › Ÿ T BEE F Ž Œ Œ % "œ ... • " ' "

3FTVMU

- " * O B D P O U F Y U X I F S F J U J T D P N N P O H S P V O E U I B U # F O M J I
T B M U Z M J D P S J D F R 3 2
- " * O B D P O U F Y U X I F S F J U J T D P N N P O H S P V O E U I B U O P C P E Z
Q / P C P E Z M J L F T T B M U Z M J D P S J D F R 3 2

* T U I J T U I F P O M Z T Q F D J B M E J T D P V S T F F k F D U P G S I F U F

3 I F U P S X D B W F T U J P O T 4 Q F D J B M E J T D P V S T F

B \$ P O U F Y U : P V S G S J F O E X P V M E M J L F U P C V Z T B M U Z M J D P
Z P V U I J O L J U R T B C B E J E F B T J O D F Z P V S G S J F O E T E F J O J

C U 8 I P M J L F T T B M U Z P O J P N Z S L J D T F T B M Q Z M J D P S J D F R

* O U F S Q S F U B U J P O

B • %̄ J T B E E F E “ U , P . B I O F E J T B E E F F Ž Ę Ć Ć % “ Ć E ... • “ ’

C • \$ J O Ğ P J T B E E F F Ž Ę Ć Ć % “ Ć E ... • “ ’

D • \$ J O Ğ \$ › Ÿ T B E E F F Ž Ę Ć Ć % “ Ć E ... • “ ’

' J H V S F

' J H V S \$ J O Ğ P

' J H V S \$ › Ÿ

3IFUP SJDBM RVFTUJPOT 4VNNBSZ

32 T BOE 32TVHHFTU BO BOTXFS UIBU JT BMSFBEZ JO U
"U UIF TBNF UJNF UIFZ NBZ SBTMP HQ B DBMTU QFB DF UIF BO

- „ 32 T XJUIJO UIF EPNBJO
- „ 32 T PVUTJEF UIF EPNBJO

5IF UXP IBWF EJKFSFOU DPOTFRVFODFT

- „ *G JU JT JOTJEF UIF EPNBJO JU EPFTORU SFTPMWFY UIF J
- „ *G JU JT PVUTJEF UIF EPNBJO JU EPYBT OPTUPMWF E DEF JTT

#BTFE PO UIFJS QSPTPEZ XF IBWF UISFF PQUJPOT

- „ *42T BOE 32T EPORU EJKFS BU BMM GBMTF
- „ 32T EJKFS GSPN *42TBOEVU2B2F UIF TBNF BTTVNFE JO UIF
UIJT XPVME TVQQPSU GPS DVSSFOU RVFTUJPO MJLF BO
- „ 5IFSF JT B UISFF XBZ EJTUJODTUB00032BFFOP42JTOV2BM
BOBMZTFT CVU DBMMT GPS B SFWJTJPO

1 S P T P E Z

32 T B S F Q S P T P E J D B M M Z E J T U J O H V J T I F E G S P N * 4 2 T J O
1 F S D F Q U J P O T U V E J F T T P O E (F 4 2 N T B B M 3 2 P T I P X U I B U U I F U X
B T T P D J B U F E X J U I B E J k F S F O U T F U P G Q S P T P E J D D V F T

	32 W T 4 2 X I B O E Q P M B S 3 2 W B 2 W T 4 2 X I
1 S P E V D U . B P O E B S ; B O O F S F U B M . B O E B S - P O B O E , J T T (F S N B # O S B V O F U B M \$ B O U P O P T F F U B M & O H M % F I I © B O E # S B V O * D F M B O E J O B O E # S B V O	
1 F S D F Q U (F S N B O F J U T D I F U B M \$ B O U P O P T F F U B M , I B S B N B O F U B M	

5 I F S F J T B U I S F F X B Z Q S P T P E J D E J T U J O D U J P O J O C P U
E J k F S F - O U F M Z B M - P B O E , J T T

1 SPTPEZ

*O MBC QSPEVDUJPO FYQFSJNFOUT PO /PSUIFSO .BOE
1BSUJDJQBOUT SFBE PVU FBDIXI JOUFSSPHBUJWF JO

'JHVS&YBNQMF PG BUSJBM

1SPTPEZ \$BOUPOFTF

-P F U B M

\$POEJUJPOT

- „ *OGPSNBUJPO 4FF*42OH {VFTUJPO
- „ /FHBUJWF 3IFUPS3DBM {VFTUJPO
- „ 1PTJUJWF 3IFUPS3DBM {VFTUJPO
- „ 1PTJUJWF 3IFUPSJDBM {VFTUJPOT BT 3FUPSUT
3FUPSU

3FTVMUT UIF TFOUFODF JOBM QBSUJDMFT 4'1 IBE UIF
GPMMPXJOH DPOUPVST

- „ *42 4IPSU EVSBUJPO MPX MFWFM '
- „ 32 4IPSU EVSBUJPO SJTJOH '
- „ 32 -POH EVSBUJPO MPX MFWFM '

\$PODMVTJPO

- „ 5IFSF JT B UISFF XBZ QSPTPEJD EJTUJODUJPO JO
\$BOUPOFTF CFUXFF ~~BOE~~BT 32

1SPTPEZ .BOEBSJO

-P BOE ,JTT

XI JOUFSSPHBUJWFT QFS UPOF

„ µçX•4e¬ QFOVMUJNBUFTZMMBCMF 5

\$POEJUJPO

„ *OGPSNBUJPO 4FF*42OH {VFTUJPO

„ /FHBUJWF 3IFUPS3DBM {VFTUJPO

„ 1PTJUJWF 3IFUPS3DBM {VFTUJPO

3FTVMUT

ÂVFTUJPOUJFSBO4DF ' PO ' PO
 UZQF EVSBUJPEV/SBUJPCXPSE 4'1

*42 TIPSUFSPHOHFTMPXFTU IJHIFTU
 32 MPOHFS *OCFUXFFO *42 BOE 32
 32 MPOHFSTIPSUFTU IJHMFTXUFTU

1SPTPEZ .BOEBSJO

1SPTPEZ .BOEBSJO

'SPNP BOE ,JTT

1SPTPEZ .BOEBSJO

\$PODMVTJPO

- 5IFSF JT B UISFF XBZ QSPTPEJD EJTUJODUJFBOEJ2BOEB
- 5IF JOWFTUJHBUFE QSPTPEJD DVFT PSEFS UIF UISFF RV

*ORVJTJUJWFGPSNBUJAMFFTUJBUJFSBDF ' PO ' PO
DPOUJOU DPOUFOU UZQF EVSBUJEOSBUJXPSE4'1
JOGP

• %]	•	*42	TIPSUFS	MPOHFTU	MPXFTU
•]	• JOGP	32	MPOHFS	*OCFUXFFO	*42BOE32
•]	• JOGP	32	MPOHFSTIPSUFTU	IJHIFTU	MPX

1SPTPEZ \$BOUPOFTF

4UJNV MJ

" BNCJHXIPMOTUFSSPHBUJWFT

KBVCJO HTPFOKBNHBB BB

FYXTIP XBOUESJDR5F# '1

Q8IPXBOUTUPESJOLDPKFF R

" .BOJQVMBUFE UIF EVSBUJPO BOE ' SJTF PB EUFBM1 PSUI

%VSBUJPO

NT

' SJTF) [

1BSUJDJQBOUT OBUJWF TQFBLFST PG \$BOUPOFTF

1SPDFEVSF UISFF BMUFSOBUJWF GPSDFE DIPJDF UB

QBSUJDVMBBS SFBEJOH

" 5IF TQFBLFS EPFT OPU LOPX XIP XBOUTUPESJOLDPKFF

" 5IF TQFBLFS UIJOLT OPCPEZ XBOUTUPESJOLDPKFF 32

" 5IF TQFBLFS BMSFBEZ LOPXT XIP XBOUTUPESJOLDPKFF

1SPTPEZ \$BOUPOFTF

%JKFSFOU DPNCJOBUIJPOT PG QJUDI DPOUPVST BOE E
QSPQPSUJPOT ~~BOE 42~~ SFTQ POTFT

-POHFS EVSBUJPO MFBET UP -BSHFS ' SJTF MFBET
NPSF ~~3~~OE MFTT *42 SFTQPO ~~N~~PTSF ~~3~~OE MFTT *42 SFTQ

1SPTPEZ \$BOUPOFTF

*42T 3T2 BOEBDBO CF EJTUJOHVJTIFE JO QSPEVDUJPO BO
FOPVHI UP BTTBBOB 32JIF TBNF TQFDJBM FkFDU UIBU UIF
)PXFWS UIF QJDUVSF JT OPU DMFBS

1SPEVDUJPO 1FSDFQUJPO

*42 MPX' TIPSU EVSBUJPO MPX' TIPSU
32 SJTJOH' TIPSU EVSBUJPO O B
32 MPX' MPOHEVSBUJPO SJTJOH' MPO

5BC4MNNBSZ PG QSPEVDUJPO BOE QFSDFQUJPO

" QPTTJCMF SFBTPO 1FSDFQUVBM DPOGVTJPO
1FSDFQUVBM DPOGVTJPO IBT CFFO SFQPSUFE JO TUV
CPUI .BOEBSJO BOEJS\$BOUPOFTF BOE .PL B C

1SPTPEZ 4VNNBSZ

#PUI \$BOUPOFTF BOE .BOEBSJO IBWF QSPTPETJBOE/FT
JO QSPEVDUJPO

» \$BOUPOFTF UIF EJTUJODUJPO JT PCTFSWFE PO UIF TFC

» .BOEBSJO CPUI UIF 4'1 BOE UIF XI QISBTF QBSUJDJQBU

5IF UISFF RVFTUJPO UZQFT XFSF BMTP EJTUJOHVJTIF

» *42T BOET3B2SF BTTPDJBUFE XJUI EJTUJODU DPNCJQBUJF

» 8IZ XFSF 320PU BTTPDJBUFE XJUI UIF TBNF JOUPOBUJPO

BT UIF POF UIFZ XFSF QSPEVDFE XJUI

% J T D V T T J P O

32 T BOE *42T XFSF BTTPDJBUFE XJUI B DF S UEBW O P O OFU
JO DPNNPO

- *42T BSF UIF NPTU JORVJTJUJWF BOE MFBTU JOGPSNBUJ
- 32 T BSF UIF MFBTU JORVJTJUJWF BOE NPTU JOGPSNBUJ

#PUIBSF SFMBUJWFMZ JOEFQFOEFOU GSPN UIF DPOU
DPOUFYU JOEFQFOEFODF NBLFT UIFN NPSF MJLFMZ U
"SSJWJOHBU UIF EFTJSFE JOTUFSU Q P U B W O M O R G U B B Z U
DPNNPO HSPVOE

- 32 T DPNNJU UIF TQ F BLFS UP JOGP

*ORVJTJUJWF JOGPSNBUJ J MFFTU J P U J F S B O D F ' PO ' PO
DPOU J O U DPOUFOU UZQF EVSBUJ E O SBUJ X O XPSE4'1
JOGP

}] %]	•	*42	TIPSUFS	MPOHFTU	MPXFU
}]	•	JOGP	32	MPOHFS	*OCFUXFFO *42 BOE 32
}]	•	JOGP	32	MPOHFSTIPSUFTU	IJHIFTU MPX

%JTDVTTJPO 4FOUFODF pJOBM UVOFT

%P SIFUPSJDBM RVFTUJPOT IBWF TJNJMBS TVQSBTFHNF

5IF #JPMPHJDBM SP (FTTFOIPWFO 4FOUFODF JOBM SJ

CJPMPHJDBM USPPUTV TPVOE TZNCPMJTN

.. 4NBMM QPXFSTFTT JOEJWJEVBMT IBWF IJHIFS QJUDI

.. 6UUFBSODFT XJUI JOBM GBMMT BSF BTTPDJBUFE XJUI

.. 6UUFBSODFT XJUI JOBM SJTFT BSF BTTPDJBUFE XJUI O

'BSLBTBOE 3PFMPGTFO

§ [FSP UP MPX DSFEFODF

©§NPEFSBUF UP IJHI DSFEFODF

©©JHI DSFEFODF

.BOEBSJO TFOUFODF JOBM QBSUJDMFT DPOGPSN UIJ

.. *42 MPX' TIPSU EVSBUJPO

.. 32 MPX' MPOHEVSBUJPO

5IF NBKPSJUZ PG MBOHVBHFT GPMMPX UIJT TZNCPMJT

EFGBVMU

.. #FMGBTU &OHMJTI BTTFSUJPOT XJUI B SJTJOH JOBM U

.. \$BSJCCFBO 4QBOJTI RVFTUJPOT XJUI B GBMMJOH JOB

1SPCMFN 5IF UIFPSZ PG CJPMPHJDBM DPEFT JT IBSE

%JTDVTTJPO 1PMBS SIFUPSJDBM RVFTUJP

5IF BOBMZTJT QSPQPTFE IFSF BQQMJFT UP QPMBS SIFUP

- \-^

#BTJD DPOWFOUJPOBM EJTDPVSTF FkFDUT

- \ • ^ JT BEEFE • U P .. UIF
- • JT BEEFE • U P .. UIF

4QFDJBM EJTDPVSTF FkFDUT

- 1PMBS 32 • G RT BEEFE • U P .. UIF
- 1PMBS 32 • G RT BEEFE • U P .. UIF

8IBU BCPVU UIF QSPTPEZ PG QPMBS 32

- 8PVME U * T + PIO B WFHFUBSJB O V IBWF UISFF E J k F S B O U E
- 32 SFBEJOHT

%JTDVTTJPO 1SFWJPVT BDDPVOUT PG 32T

"TTFSUJPO MJLFBDDPMDUFTBZTFSUJPOT

• *UGPMPXT GSPN UIF GBDU UIBU UIFZ DPNNJU UIF TQFB

• 5IFJS JOUFOEFE SFBEJOH JT FODPEFE CZ QSPTPEZ

{VFTUJPO MJLFBDDPVOUT 32TBSF RVFTUJPOT

• 5IFJS CBTJD DPOWFOUJPOBM EJTDPVSTF FkFDUT BSF UI
XIJDIFYQMBJO UIFJS RVFTUJPO MJLFBDDPVOUT

• 5IFJS BTTFSUJPO MJLFBDDPVOUT MBWPS DPNFT GSPN TQFDJBM F

§ 32 TIBWF TQFDJBM FkFDUT UIBU SFTPMWF UIF JTTVF

§ 32 TIBWF TQFDJBM FkFDUT UIBU EP OPU SFTPMWF UIF JTTV
SFTPMWFE CZ DPOTVMUJOH UIF DPNNPO HSPVOE

+BNJFTPO TBOE232BWF EJTUJODU NBS0JOHFF2UQS
BOE 32BSF JOEFFE UHFOSJDV

•)PXFWS UIF HFOFSJD GFFM JT EVF UP UIF BWBJMBCJM
TPBNFUBWBSJBCMF QSPQPTFE CZ +BNJFTPO JT O

%JTDVTTJPO -JNJUBUJPO

00MZ XI JOUFSSPHBUJWFT

00MZIP

00MZ TJOHMFUPO BOTXFST

U8IBURTHPJOHUPIBQQFOUPUIFTBJEFXIFOUIFZHSP

5IFSPMPGTFOUFODFSJFOBMBQBSBJEMOP

00MZ .BOEBSJOBOE\$BOUPOFTF

"DFSUBJOQPQVMBUJPO TU OEZFBSVOEFSHSBET E

-BCTFUUJOH

/PEBUBPOSSJDPBOE%R*NQFSJP

\$PODMVTJPO

* DPODMVEF UIBU UIF UXP UZQFT PG SIFUPSJDBM RVFTUJ
JOUFSQSFUBUJPO SFMJFT PO UIF DPNNPO HSPVOE

32 TBSF B QSBHNBUJD QIFOPNFOPO BMUIPVHI TJODF UI
FODPEF TPNFUIJOH ByFS BMM UIBU UIF BOTXFS JT GSPN

32 TEP OPU SFRVJSF UIF IFBSFS UP CF VQ UP EBUF XSU L
EFGFDUJWF DPOUFYU 5IFZ EP OPU CFMPOH UP UIF XBTU
LOPXJOH UIF EPNBJO XPSME LOPXMFEHF NBZ QMBZ B S

#PUI 32 BOE 32BSF QSBHNBUJD UP TPNF FYUFOU BOE NPE
JOGPSNBUJWF DPOUFOU DBO BDDPVOU GPS JU

5IBOLZPV

3PHFS : -P .BYJNF " 5VMMJOHBOE +VTUJO
-JTB \$IFOH ;IBOBP 'V #FjUB (ZVSJT ;PF -BN .JM
1JMBS 1SJFUP 'MPSJT 3PFMPGTFO (VJMMI
"VEJFODFT PG *\$114 \$- " -BC1IPO
-4 " BOE UIF #JBTFE {VFTUJPOT XPSLTIPQ E
BOE BMM QBSUJDDJQBOUT

3FGFSF*ODFT

#BOVB[J[J "UJTTB BOE \$BTTBOESF \$SFTXFMM *TUIBU B SFBM R
JQFT RVPFTUJPO JOU 1 8 0 B B B B B 0 0 H 0 P G \$-14DBHP *-

#JF[NB .BS-B BOE ,ZMF 3BXMJOT 3IFUPSJDBM RVFT4"JBOT 4FW

#SBVO #FUUJOB /JDPMF %FI© +BOB /FJUTDI %BOJFMB 8PDIOFS BO
BOE *OGPSNBUJPO 4FFLJOH \$V0HTMBJHPOBQ104(05NBO

\$BQPOJHSP *WBOP BOB HFRUP \$QSBMTRVFTUJPO STP BDFRE JFOHTJPOGT4JOO
L

%FI© /JDPMF BOE #FUUJOB #SBVO PG SIFUPSJDBM RHMJTTUJBOHV B & R
-JOHVJTUJDT

%FI© /JDPMF BOE #FUUJOB #SBVO 5IF *OUPOBUJPO PG *OGPSN
+PVSOBM PG (FSNBOJD -JOHVJTUJDT

'BSLBT % ' BOE ,JN # #SVDF 00 SFBDUJOH+UPW \$0BMSRUG 4 0 N B O

'BSLBT %POLB' BOE OPOJDBM BOE OPO DBO \$04B0MRS \$FTUJPSQJDDFUPO 60

'BSLBT %POLB' BOE 'MPSJT 3PFMPGTFO %JWJTJPO PG MBCPS
+PVSOBM PG 4FNBOUJDT

(FMVZLFOT 3POBME 00 UIF NZUI PG SJT JPHVSOBMOPEGUJSPDLNBQJ

References II

- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 2004. *FZWBZa` a`aYk aXFa` WŠ` V;` fa` Sf[a`*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Han, Chung-Hye. 2002. Interpreting interrogatives as rhetorical questions. >[YgS112:201–229.
- Jamieson, E. A. 2018. Questions, biases, and ‘negation’: Evidence from Scots varieties. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Kharaman, Mariya, Manluolan Xu, Carsten Eulitz, and Bettina Braun. 2019. The processing of prosodic cues to rhetorical question interpretation: Psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic evidence. In ;@F7DEB775: \$"#+.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2017. Negated polarity questions as denegations of assertions. In 5a` foSef[hWVte [[Yad_ Sf[a` efdUfgdWVS`fVd Sf[hVtS` V eLS`Sd [b[UfsgdVt 359–398. Springer.
- Liu, Min, Chen Yiya, and Niels O. Schiller. 2021. Context matters for tone and intonation processing in Mandarin. >S` YgSYMS` V EbWVZ 1–21.
- Lo, Roger Y., Angelika Kiss, and Justin R. Leung. 2021. Two types of rhetorical questions: Evidence from Cantonese prosody. Poster presentation at LSA95.
- Lo, Roger Yu-Hsiang, and Angelika Kiss. 2020. Durational and Pitch-marking of Rhetorical Wh-Questions in Mandarin. In BcbUWV [YeaXEbWVZ BcbVt #", 429–433. Tokyo, Japan.
- Lo, Roger Yu-Hsiang, Angelika Kiss, and Maxime A. Tulling. 2019. The prosodic properties of the Cantonese sentence-final particles SS# and SS% in rhetorical wh-questions. In BcbUWV [YeaXfZW#fZ ;` fVd Sf[a` S^5a` YdVt e aX BZa` V [UEUWUe 502–506. Melbourne, Australia.

References III

- Neitsch, Jana, Bettina Braun, and Nicole Dehé. 2018. The role of prosody for the interpretation of rhetorical questions in German. In *EbWUZ BchaVk +*.
- Ohala, J. J. 1994. The frequency code underlies the sound symbolic use of voice pitch. In *Eag` Vek_ Ta[e_*, ed. L. Hinton, J. Nichols, and O. J. J. Ohala, 325–347. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orrico, Riccardo, and Mariapaola D’Imperio. 2020. Individual empathy levels affect gradual intonation-meaning mapping: The case of biased questions in Salerno Italian. *>STadSfack BZa` a`aYk, <agd S^aXfZWBeaU[Sf[a` Xad >STadSfack BZa` a`aYk* 11:12, 1–39.
- Poschmann, Claudia. 2008. All declarative questions are attributive? *4WV[S` <agd S^aX>[Yg[ef[Le* 22:247–269.
- Prieto, Pilar, and Paolo Roseano. 2021. The encoding of epistemic operations in two Romance languages: The interplay between intonation and discourse markers. *<agd S^aXBdSY_ Sf[Le* 172:146–163.
- Riemer, Marga. 2020. Rhetorical questions as indirect assertions. In *FZWAj Xadv: S` VTaa] aX3eeVdf[a`*, ed. Sanford Goldberg. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rohde, Hannah. 2006. Rhetorical questions as redundant interrogatives. *ES` 6[Wa >[Yg[ef[Le* BSbVte 2.
- Schaffer, Deborah. 2005. Can rhetorical questions function as retorts? Is the Pope Catholic? *<agd S^aXBdSY_ Sf[Le* 37:433–460.

References IV

- Xu, Bo Robert, and Peggy Mok. 2012a. Cross-linguistic perception of intonation by Mandarin and Cantonese listeners. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Chinese Linguistics* (.
- Xu, Bo Robert, and Peggy Mok. 2012b. Intonation perception of low-pass filtered speech in Mandarin and Cantonese. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Chinese Linguistics*, 02:1–6. Nanjing, China.
- Zahner, Katharina, Manluolan Xu, Yiya Chen, Nicole Dehé, and Bettina Braun. 2020. The prosodic marking of rhetorical questions in Standard Chinese. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Chinese Linguistics* #".