

英汉中动结构的 句法语义研究

THE SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS OF
ENGLISH AND CHINESE MIDDLE CONSTRUCTIONS

王和玉◎著

中国社会科学出版社

英汉中动结构的 句法语义研究

THE SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS OF
ENGLISH AND CHINESE MIDDLE CONSTRUCTIONS

王和玉◎著

中国社会科学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

英汉中动结构的句法语义研究: The Syntax and Semantics of English and Chinese Middle Constructions / 王和玉著. —北京: 中国社会科学出版社, 2016. 11
ISBN 978 - 7 - 5161 - 9023 - 4

I. ①英… II. ①王… III. ①英语—句法结构—对比研究—汉语
IV. ①H314. 3②H146. 3

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2016)第 237627 号

出 版 人 赵剑英
责任编辑 陈雅慧
责任校对 李伟华
责任印制 戴 宽

出 版 中国社会科学出版社
社 址 北京鼓楼西大街甲 158 号
邮 编 100720
网 址 <http://www.csspw.cn>
发 行 部 010 - 84083685
门 市 部 010 - 84029450
经 销 新华书店及其他书店

印 刷 北京明恒达印务有限公司
装 订 廊坊市广阳区广增装订厂
版 次 2016 年 11 月第 1 版
印 次 2016 年 11 月第 1 次印刷

开 本 710 × 1000 1/16
印 张 19.25
插 页 2
字 数 289 千字
定 价 69.00 元

凡购买中国社会科学出版社图书,如有质量问题请与本社营销中心联系调换
电话:010 - 84083683
版权所有 侵权必究

国家留学基金委与广东省哲社十二五规划项目“语态现象与
动词及物性的最简句法阐释（GD14XWW18）”资助

摘 要

本书是在生成句法理论框架下对英汉中动结构的最简探索。中动结构关涉不同句式，呈现独特而复杂的句法语义特点。如何将表面不同的各种句式纳入统一的句法结构，并且将其句法语义特点最大程度地在结构上得以体现和限制，是本书要解决的问题。具体而言，本书回答四个问题：(i) 中动句的语法主语为何不允准施事论元？(ii) 中动句“修饰语要求”的实质是什么？(iii) 何种句法机制令中动句体现非事件性？(iv) 中动句的话题效果和评价意义在句法上如何体现？

根据最简句法理念，功能语类及其所带特征是语言间参数差异的关键 (Chomsky 1995: 6)。参数化不仅跨语言存在，也跨结构存在 (MacDonald 2008: 30)。不同结构之间的差异也应归因于相关功能语类上的特征。本书以致使轻动词 ([uC] -Featured *verb*) 和情态屈折语 ([iMOD] -Featured T_{MOD}) 两个功能范畴为基础勾勒中动结构，解释和限制其句法语义特点。两个功能范畴都带有情态特征，在句法上形成一致关系 (Agree)，通过运算中的特征匹配和赋值，生成中动句 $T_{MOD}P$ 。

致使轻动词带未赋值的题元特征 [uC]，需要外论元致事 (Cause) 与之合并。因此，中动句主语是非施事 (non-Agent)，其属性决定谓语事件能否发生。中动句的主语尽管在语义上是谓语动词的受事 (Patient) 或附加论元 (Adjunct)，但结构上都是在 spec-*vP* 位置合并的致事。情态屈折语 T_{MOD} 具有未赋值的 [iTNS] / [iASP] 特征，在结构上不能作为有效的时空算子，约束事件论元，将谓语事件投射到现实世界。但情态屈折语的 [iMOD] 特征是可解特征，可以作为模态算子约束事件论元，将谓语事件投射到可能世界。如此，中动句便获得非事件

性和可能性的语义解读。中动句谓语动词上的 $[uTNS] / [uASP]$ 特征无法在句法运算中被赋值, 不能满足语音界面的可读性条件。为挽救已形成的句法体, 英汉中动句分别采纳现在时和未完整体的缺省形式 (default form)。

“修饰语要求”对于中动句而言只是副现象。中动句对修饰语的依赖由其句法结构决定。语义上, 修饰语修饰事件, 使没有宾语的光杆 VP 由个体 ($\langle e \rangle$ type entity) 变为谓语 ($\langle t \rangle$ type predication), 满足致使轻动词的补语要求; 结构上, 修饰语可作为有效的形态句法手段约束事件论元。除修饰语外, 显性情态助动词、否定词、填补词 *do* 等都是约束事件论元的形态句法手段。

C 到 T 的特征传递既呈现跨语言变异, 也呈现跨结构差异。若边缘性特征 ($[iTOPIC]$ feature) 与一致性特征 (phi-features) 同时传递给情态屈折语 T_{MOD} , 外论元致事 Cause 移位至 spec-TP 可同时核查两类特征。如此, 论元移位 (A-movement) 与非论元移位 (A' -movement) 便合二为一, 解释了中动句的话题性和评价意义。

致使轻动词和情态屈折语分析规避了中动句在词库还是句法生成的争论, 吸收了参数化分析法的优势。中动句的受事主语既可与轻动词 *v* 外合并, 也可从内论元位置移位至 spec-*v*P 为致使轻动词 *v* 的 $[uC]$ 特征赋值。内合并的证据来自罗曼语中动句和部分英语中动句中反身代词的使用。

本书将中动句的各种句法语义特点看成彼此联系, 相互制约的因素, 且最大程度上在结构上得以解释和限制, 体现了结构和语义相互依存的关系。研究证明了中动结构 (the type) 如何在同一语言 and 不同语言中体现为不同的中动句式 (the tokens)。与英语相比, 汉语中动句的情态屈折语多显性体现, 语义也更饱和; 英语中动句多依靠副词修饰语满足句法语义要求, 而汉语中的 “NP + V-起来 + AP” 中动句因无显性情态屈折语, 依赖形容词做修饰语。另外, 在选择缺省的时/体形式时, 英语采纳现在时, 汉语借用起始体。这既与现在时/起始体与语境的语义联系相关, 也与两种语言中时体概念的语法化程度不同相关。

将句法轻动词 *v* 重构为 $[uC]$ 和/或 $[uA]$ 题元特征, 语态范畴

得以化解,语态可能是轻动词上题元特征所决定的谓语及物性的差异表现。延伸情态屈折语的分析,英语将来时得以取消,表将来事态的句子都是情态屈折语投射。若论元移位与非论元移位可通过一次操作完成,英汉两种语言所呈现的主语/话题优先的类型学差异可能在于:前者允准更多的事件论元作话题,而后者允许更多的主语和话题重叠。修饰关系若进入语言运算系统,与题元关系一样通过合并拓展结构。

句法与语义的接口问题是最简句法的核心问题(Chomsky 2000: 96)。运算机制优先考虑语义解读部门的要求(Chomsky 2007: 12)。语言是满足界面条件的最优设计(Chomsky 2008: 135)。对中动句的结构和语义进行最简探索,可洞窥语言运算机制如何满足语义系统的要求,呈现其设计的完美性。

关键词 中动结构;致使轻动词;情态屈折语;题元特征;特征传递

Abstract

Middles involve various constructions and exhibit complex syntactic and semantic characteristics. If there is a syntactic entity of middles, it remains a challenge to sketch a uniform underlying middle structure which could subsume superficially various constructions and simultaneously reflect and constrain the observed middle semantics. From a minimalist perspective, this study takes this challenge by exploring both the syntax and semantics of middles in English and Chinese.

Specifically, this study intends to answer four questions: (i) Why does the surface subject of middles disallow Agent? (ii) What is the nature of “the adverbial requirement”? (iii) What is the syntactic mechanism that renders middles non-eventive? (iv) How are middles as categorical judgments and evaluative sentences syntactically realized?

Given our assumption that the uniqueness of middles should be traced to the features on functional categories, I hypothesize that two functional categories, namely, a causative light *verb* with [$uC(AUSE)$] theta feature and a tenseless T_{MOD} with [$iMOD(AL)$] feature play decisive roles in the structure of middles, the former disallowing Agent to project as the external argument, the latter being responsible for the non-eventive and evaluative interpretation. More importantly, these two functional categories co-appear to establish an Agree relation through featuring-sharing and feature-valuation, and they conspire to lead to the responsibility and possibility reading, the generic and modality interpretation, the topic effect and the adverbial requirement.

The eventual thematic relation between nominal elements and predicate

verbs fails to obtain if the light *verb* is not taken into account. It follows that the thematic relation of middle predicates should be traced to the functional light *verb*, particularly, to the theta features on it. Since a light *vP* could be either agentive or causative, we reconstruct the light *verb* into binary [*uA* (GENT)] and/or [*uC*] theta features to establish its syntactic role in licensing the external argument. Because the light *verb* involved in a middle predicate is [*uC*]-featured, it needs a Cause NP to syntactically value this uninterpretable feature. Naturally, it licenses the external argument of Cause instead of Agent. The Patient/Adjunct subject in a middle clause is actually the Cause syntactically merged at spec-*vP*. This accounts for the responsibility reading that an inherent property of the subject entity is responsible for the predicated event.

“The adverbial requirement” is by no means middle-specific. It is epiphenomenal and determined by the underlying middle structure. Semantically, an adverbial helps an objectless bare VP obtain a $\langle t \rangle$ type predication to be a qualified complement for the Causative *verb*. Structurally, it serves as a morpho-syntactical device to bind the VP-denoting event argument. Because an overt modal auxiliary, a negation and a dummy *do* could function equally to bind the event argument morpho-syntactically, they could all appear to rescue the adverbial-less middles.

A tenseless [*iMOD*]-featured T_{MOD} heading a middle clause fails to bind the predicated event as a temporal operator, hence the non-eventive reading. Unable to map the event onto the actual world, the T_{MOD} links the event with a possible world by providing a modal operator to bind the event argument, thus the possibility reading. Through the operation of Agree, T_{MOD} (the probe) gets its unvalued [*iMOD*]-feature valued when it targets the according feature on the Causative light *verb* (the goal).

C-to-T feature inheritance allows both cross-linguistic and cross-structural variations. Given that C may DONATE both [*iTOPIC*] and phi-features to T_{MOD} , the same one movement values both EDGE and phi-features, thus the combination of A-movement and A'-movement. This being the case, the

grammatical subject overlaps with the categorical topic and the evaluative reading naturally follows.

Empirically, the [*uC*]-featured *verb* and [*iMOD*]-featured T_{MOD} analysis reveals how a middle sentence (the **type**) is realized through various constructions (as **tokens**). Theoretically, our study involves a minimalist inquiry of the syntax-semantics interface and provides knowledge about how human's computational system is "an optimization primarily to the conceptual-intentional interface" (Chomsky 2007: 12).

Key Words: middles; [*uC*]-featured *verb*; [*iMOD*]-featured T_{MOD} ; theta feature(s); C-to-T feature DONATE

前 言

英语和汉语中都存在着大量的受事或工具主语句，其谓语动词无被动标记，与主动句类似，如（1-2）所示：

- (1) a. The car drives quickly.
b. His new novel sells well.
c. The pencil draws beautiful lines.
- (2) a. 这辆车开起来很快。
b. 事情的确不好办。
c. 这辆自行车容易/能/可以骑。

在德语和罗曼语里，相应的句子动词带反身代词标记，与被动句类似，如（3）所示：

- (3) a. Das Buch liest**sich** leicht. (German)
the book read**sich** easily
- b. El libro **se** lee bien. (Spanish)
the book**se** reads easily

教学语法认为此类结构是“主动形式表被动意义”，也有学者称之为中动语态、中动结构或中动句。

中动句因其独特的句法表现和语义特点成为语法界的关注热点，其研究涉及形态、句法、语义、语用等不同语言层面。已有的中动句文献

可大致分为生成语法研究、认知语言学研究、跨语言对比研究和语料库研究。生成语法主要关注中动句的句法结构。早期的句法研究围绕中动句是词法生成还是句法生成展开,近期基于最简句法方案的分析有语态投射 (VoiceP) 与及物性投射 (TrP) 等分析法。认知语法将中动句看作一种特定而多产的构式,其句法表现和语义特点是一定构式经历语法化的结果。跨语言对比研究则主要关注中动句在英语和其他语言中的差异表现并尝试提供一些解释。如法语中动句为什么外论元显现?罗曼语为何需要附着语 (clitic) 构成合格中动句?语料库研究既有历时考察,又有共时对比。如中动句和其他相关结构 (如做格句、难易句) 存在历时联系,不同语篇使用中动句的频域存在差异。

随着越来越多的语言进入研究者的视野,目前的中动句文献显得纷繁复杂。因缺乏统一的概念界定,不同研究讨论的中动句并不同质。已有的描述性研究虽能总结中动句独特的句法语义特点,但不能解释现象后面的理据。跨语言对比和语料库研究突出了中动句的共时变异,也展示了中动句与其他相关结构的历时联系,但疏于零散,缺乏系统阐释。认知功能语法将使用者意图和话语要求等纳入语法分析,但缺乏形式化处理,也无法处理中动句的跨语言差异,将中动句的特点归于构式义实质上回避了很多问题。就研究方法而言,生成句法能为中动句研究提供相对客观和形式化的解释。但已有的句法研究只关注谓语内部的题元关系问题,未能在结构上有效解释中动句的情态义、通指义、话题性和修饰语要求。

* 形式句法能否为不同的中动句式提供统一可行的推导方案?如何解释主动句、中动句与被动句的联系和差异?各种语态现象是否存在依赖和转换关系?语态是独立的语法范畴吗?中动句独特的句法语义特点 (句首主语的责任性条件,句子的非事件性、可能性、评价义,句子的话题性和修饰语要求等) 如何在结构上得到充分体现和解释?如何合理阐释中动句的各种语内语际变异现象?本书尝试为上述问题提供可能的解决方案。

采纳基于一致性关系 (Agree) 进行特征匹配与赋值的最简句法运算理念,本研究主张:中动句独特的句法语义特点应归因于相关功能语

类上的特征。就谓语内部的题元关系而言,轻动词 *v* 的题元特征非常关键;而中动句的非事件性、话题性和评价义都与其句子结构中功能语类 C 和 T 上的相关特征及其特征互动有关。理论上,本书通过构建轻动词 *v* 上的题元特征,试图化解语态语法范畴,提出及物性三分法,重新解释传统的语态二分与三分现象。此外,通过构建情态范畴 T_{MOD} 支撑中动句结构 $T_{MOD}P$ 的假设,本书尝试从非现实情态的角度解释中动句的情态义和非事件性,将汉语中的难易句、“好 + V”句、“能/可 + V”句和部分“NP + V - 起来 + AP”句与英语中动句式进行统一分析。中动句子结构中 C 可能同时将边缘性特征与一致性特征传递给 T_{MOD} , 导致主语与话题重叠的效果。修饰语、情态词或者否定标记都是有效约束事件论元的形态手段,以确保中动谓语的事件意义被界面有效解读。

该书基于笔者的博士论文修改而成,也结合了笔者的近期研究发现和成果。修改书稿期间,笔者有幸获得国家留学基金委资助,在美国马里兰大学语言学系访问学习,获得了很多宝贵的文献资料,也从导师 Howard Lasnik 教授和 Norbert Horstein 教授的讲座与课堂讨论中收获了不少最新的句法理念和建议。本书的出版还要感谢广东省哲社十二五规划项目“语态现象与动词及物性的最简句法阐释(GD14XWW18)”的资助。从语言事实来看,中动句关涉大量的不同句式,呈现语际与语内、共时和历时的变异现象;从理论上,中动句牵涉语态范畴、事件结构、论元结构、动词的及物性、修饰语的语义句法属性等诸多问题。因此,中动结构是语言理论发展的试金石,也是检验和推动语法理论研究的有效工具。透过中动句这一窗口,本研究总结了笔者对诸多语言事实和句法问题的粗浅思考,其科学性和有效性有待更多的语料支撑和理论修正,期待各位专家同仁批评赐教,以达成对中动句以及语态现象等语言问题的进一步理解和认识。

Acknowledgements

This work is based upon my Ph. D dissertation completed in 2014 when I graduated from Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, where I experienced the most unforgettable and fruitful days in my life. I want to express my heartfelt thanks for those that contributed to my enjoyment in GDUFS and to this research.

I owe my first debt to my supervisor, Professor Wen Binli, who has lively imparted the knowledge of generative grammar to me and tenderly safeguarded the budding and blossoming of my academic dream. In my memory, he is always the first to understand my crudest idea, and the last to be impatient with my wordy expression. He stood beside me in every stage of my dissertation: from narrowing down the topic, to working out the essentials, to refining the manuscript to be a presentable version. Being with Professor Wen, I fortunately witnessed the rare possibility of being utterly free of pride and prejudice, of mixing sense and sensibility, and of combining kindness to students and great expectations on them.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Professor He Xiaowei, Professor Huo Yongshou, Professor Zhang Qingwen, Professor Chen Jianping and Dr. Lu Shouchun for their insightful lectures and ideas. I want to thank Professor Zhang Qingwen for her criticisms of my research proposal which was harsh at first but turned out to be constructive and thought-provoking, and hence valuable in my later thinking. In addition, her emphasis on language data usually pulls me back from impractical theoretic wandering to practical linguistic analysis. I'd like to thank Professor He Xiaowei for his guiding me

through Minimalism and his suggestions about my study. Special thanks go to Dr. Ma Zhigang, who is always being there as a source of suggestion and support with his greatest sincerity and incomparable wisdom. Because of him, I realized how the virtues of modesty and generosity could enlighten one's intellectual perspective and ingenuity.

I thank all the members of the Syntax Seminar Group of GDUFS, who meet every two weeks. From them I gained great insight and inspiration for doing generative syntax. I am grateful to the School of Foreign Languages, GDUT, for supporting me by reducing my workload and exempting me from doing some routine work in the last five years. Great thanks go to Professor Ian Roberts, Professor He Wenzhong and Chen Wei who emailed to me some treasured reference works and suggestions on middles. Among all my friends, Professor Cheng Jie deserves special mention for his timely guide and help, valuable suggestions, sincere trust and encouragement, without which my PhD dream is unlikely to come true.

Special thanks go to Guangdong Office of Philosophical and Social Science (GD14XWW18) and China Scholarship Council that granted the financial support for my one-year stay and study in the Linguistics Department of the University of Maryland, where I sharpened my ideas under the guidance of Professor Howard Lasnik and Professor Norbert Hornstein by attending their lectures and seminars.

Finally, I want to thank my family: my parents who have done almost all the household chores, my husband who has shouldered the father-and-mother responsibility of taking care of our son, my sister and brother-in-law who have provided their encouragement, while I was doing my Ph. D dissertation and relevant research. I want to, in particular, thank my lovely boy, Panpan, who seemingly steals my time by creating troubles but actually constitutes an endless source of hope and strength for me to move ahead.

Contents

前言	(1)
Acknowledgements	(4)
Chapter One General Introduction	(1)
1.1 A Brief Survey of Middles	(1)
1.2 Syntactic and Semantic Properties of Middles	(6)
1.3 Identifying Middles in English and Chinese	(7)
1.4 A Critical Review of Syntactic Study on Middles	(10)
1.4.1 The Lexical Approach	(11)
1.4.2 The Syntactic Approach	(14)
1.4.3 The Parameterized Approach	(18)
1.4.4 The Minimalist Approach	(19)
1.4.5 The Semantic Approach	(24)
1.4.6 Summary	(29)
1.5 Research Questions	(30)
1.6 Overview of Our Core Assumptions	(31)
1.7 Layout of the Book	(32)
Chapter Two Theoretical Preliminaries	(34)
2.1 Type and Token	(34)
2.2 Theta Features and Syntactic Derivation	(35)
2.3 Feature Inheritance from C to T	(37)
2.4 Agree	(38)
2.4.1 Agr as Functional Heads	(38)

2. 4. 2	Agree as Local Syntactic Relation	(39)
2. 4. 3	A Feature-Sharing Version of Agree	(41)
2. 5	Summary	(44)

Chapter Three A [*u*C]-Featured *verb* Analysis of

	Middle Predicates	(46)
3. 1	Theta Relations and Syntactic Derivation	(47)
3. 1. 1	Lexicalist vs. Non-Lexicalist Debate	(47)
3. 1. 2	Theta Roles as Theta Features	(51)
3. 1. 3	The Light <i>verb</i> and Theta Features	(53)
3. 1. 4	Valuing Theta Features in SD	(58)
3. 1. 5	Summing Up	(61)
3. 2	Theta Relations in Middle Predicates	(62)
3. 2. 1	The Responsibility Reading and Causative Analysis	(62)
3. 2. 2	A [<i>u</i> C]-Feature <i>verb</i> Analysis	(64)
3. 2. 3	Merits of the [<i>u</i> C]-Featured <i>verb</i> Analysis	(67)
3. 3	English Middles Under the [<i>u</i> C]-Featured <i>verb</i> Analysis	(69)
3. 3. 1	Patient-Subject Middles	(69)
3. 3. 2	Adjunct-Subject Middles	(72)
3. 3. 3	Agent as Non-External Argument	(74)
3. 3. 4	Summing Up	(77)
3. 4	Chinese Middles Under the [<i>u</i> C]-Featured <i>verb</i> Analysis	(77)
3. 4. 1	Patient-Subject Middles	(78)
3. 4. 2	Adjunct-Subject Middles	(80)
3. 4. 3	Middle Status of "NP + V- <i>qilai</i> + AP" Constructions	(82)
3. 4. 4	Summing Up	(86)
3. 5	Extension of the [<i>u</i> C]-Featured <i>verb</i> Analysis	(86)
3. 5. 1	Other Constructions Involving the [<i>u</i> C]-Featured <i>verb</i>	(87)
3. 5. 2	Reflexive Middles in Romanic Languages	(88)