

摘要

韩国语和汉语祈使句的本体研究已经比较细致全面，但对比研究相对薄弱，研究水准和层次有待提高。首先，从外部句类划分来看，间接言语行为形成了对句类划分标准的挑战；其次，从祈使句内部系统来看，如何进行下位分类，有多少次类等问题还需进一步研究。再次，从韩汉祈使句内部结构特点来看，主语和谓语的构成、语尾和助词的作用、肯定与否定的不对称、省略与强调的功能等问题促使我们对两种语言的共性和个性进行仔细归纳和解释。

本论文在前人研究的基础上，以言语行为理论为指导，确立了祈使句成立条件和范围，分析和对比了韩汉肯定祈使句、否定祈使句、强调祈使句以及间接祈使句等在句法语义、认知、语用和类型学方面的特点。通过对比得出：

一，韩汉肯定祈使句的主语和谓语构成上相似，且一般都具有[+述人]特点，“生命度”要求较高。韩国语倾向于形态型祈使，汉语倾向于词汇型祈使。

二，韩汉否定祈使句在谓语和否定标记构成上差别不大，但在数量和意义上存在不对称性。两种语言的否定祈使句都具有歧义性和预设性特点。从否定意义的标记性角度看，韩国语无标记否定居多，汉语有标记否定较韩国语多。

三，韩汉祈使句都能通过主语隐现和呼语化、谓语变化或省略、副词或情态词添加、语调调节等表达强调祈使意义，不同之处是韩国语还可以通过终结语尾的变换表达强调意义而汉语通过句末尾词的添加表达强调祈使意义。韩汉强调祈使句中谓语的变化部分差别较大，韩国语主要通过添加辅助动词实现祈使意义的弱化或强化；而汉语则主要通过谓语的重叠、谓语部分句式的变换来实现。“主观性”和“认知凸显”作为重要影响因子作用于韩汉强调祈使句。

四，韩汉陈述句、疑问句、感叹句等都可以用作间接祈使句，体现肯定和否定两类祈使意义。各类间接祈使句之间存在规约性差别，肯定与否定表达之间存在不对称性特点。间接祈使句的使用符合“礼貌原则”和“面子保全论”，同时也违反了语言的“经济性原则”和“会话合作原则”。

关键词：韩国语；汉语；祈使句；对比研究

Abstract

The ontological studies of Korean and Chinese imperative sentences have been relatively detailed and comprehensive. But the contrastive study is relatively weak, and research level should be improved. First, from the perspective of external sentence category, indirect speech act has formed a challenge to the standard of sentence category. Second, from the perspective of imperative sentence internal system, problems of how to further classify and how many categorizations still need further study. Besides, from the perspective of internal structure characteristics between Korean and Chinese imperative sentences, some issues prompted us to carefully summarize and explain the general and individual characteristics between the two languages. These issues include structure of the subject and predicate, role of the ending and auxiliary, asymmetry between affirmation and negation, function of ellipsis and emphasis.

Based on previous study, this paper guided by speech act theory, established the conditions and scope of imperative sentence. Meanwhile, the paper analyzed and compared characteristics on syntax-semantics, cognition, pragmatics and typology aspects, including affirmative and negative imperative sentence, imperative sentence and indirect imperative expression. By comparison, we draw the following conclusions.

Firstly, for Korean and Chinese affirmative imperative sentence, it is similar to composition of their subject and predicate, both languages generally have a characteristic of describing people, and the demand of animacy is higher. Korean tends to morphotypes imperative and Chinese tends to lexical imperative.

Secondly, on Korean and Chinese positive imperative sentence aspect, there is little difference on composition of their predicate and negation mark. But there is asymmetry on the number and significance. Negative imperative sentences of the two languages both have ambiguity and presupposition. From the perspective of the markedness of negative meaning, there are more no marked negation in Korean,

however, there are more marked negation in Chinese.

Thirdly, both Korean and Chinese imperative sentences could express emphasizing imperative significance through aspects such as subject appear or hide, vocative expression, predicate changes or ellipsis, adverbs or modal words adding, tone adjustment ,etc. Korean could express emphasizing imperative significance by changing final ending, but Chinese express it by adding words at the end of the sentence. The predicate changes are quite different from emphasizing expression between Korean and Chinese imperative sentences. Korean strengthens or weakens imperative significance by adding auxiliary verbs. But Chinese mainly expresses it by predicate overlap or part of the sentence transformation. As important influencing factors, subjectivity and cognitive salience act on Korean and Chinese emphasizes the imperative sentence.

Finally, Korean and Chinese declarative sentence, interrogative sentences and exclamatory sentence all can be used to indirect imperative which can reflect the affirmation and negation of two types of imperative significance. There are differences of conventionality among all the indirect imperative expression. And there is asymmetry between affirmation and negation expression. Besides, using indirect imperative conformed politeness principle and face-saving theory, however, it violated the economy principle and conversational cooperative principle.

Keywords: Korean; Chinese; imperative sentence; contrastive study