



· 语言学论丛 ·

限定性关系结构 生成语法研究

陈宗利 ©著

A Generative Study of Restrictive Relative Constructions

A Generative Study of Restrictive Relative Constructions

A Generative Study of Restrictive Relative Constructions

A Generative Study of Restrictive Relative Constructions



北京大学出版社
PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS

A Generative Study of Restrictive Relative Constructions

限定性关系结构生成语法研究

陈宗利 著



北京大学出版社
PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

限定性关系结构生成语法研究:英文/陈宗利著. —北京:北京大学出版社, 2007. 11

(语言学论丛)

ISBN 978-7-301-12698-1

I. 限… II. 陈… III. 语法学—研究—英文 IV. H04

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2007)第 135269 号

书 名: A Generative Study of Restrictive Relative Constructions

限定性关系结构生成语法研究

著作责任者: 陈宗利 著

责任编辑: 孙凤兰

标准书号: ISBN 978-7-301-12698-1/H · 1827

出版发行: 北京大学出版社

地 址: 北京市海淀区成府路 205 号 100871

网 址: <http://www.pup.cn>

电子邮箱: zpup@pup.pku.edu.cn

电 话: 邮购部 62752015 发行部 62750672 编辑部 62767315

出版部 62754962

印 刷 者: 北京宏伟双华印刷有限公司

经 销 者: 新华书店

650 毫米×980 毫米 16 开本 15 印张 248 千字

2007 年 11 月第 1 版 2007 年 11 月第 1 次印刷

定 价: 29.50 元

未经许可, 不得以任何方式复制或抄袭本书之部分或全部内容。

版权所有, 侵权必究 举报电话: 010-62752024

电子邮箱: fd@pup.pku.edu.cn

List of Abbreviations

ABL	Absolutive Case
ACC	Accusative Case
A-movement	phrasal movement to an argument (A) position
A'-movement	phrasal movement to a non-argument (A') position
ASP	aspect marker
ATB movement	across the board movement
BT	binding theory
CFC	complete functional complex
C ⁰	the Complementizer head
CL	classifier
CLLD	clitic left dislocation
Correl-Con	correlative construction
Comp	the Comp area
CP	Complementizer Phrase
CTM	clause type marker
D ⁰	the Determiner head
D _{rel}	relative determiner
DE	modifier marker in Chinese
DEC	declarative marker
Dem	demonstrative
D-Linked	discourse-linked
DOM	direct object marker
DP	Determiner Phrase
ECP	the empty category principle

ERG	Ergative Case marker
EV	eventive marker
FEM	feminine marker
GB	government and binding
GEN	Genitive Case marker
Gen	the Genetic head
GenP	Genetic Phrase
DNm	the Demonstrative-Numeral-Classifier chunk
DNmN	the Demonstrative-Numeral-Classifier-Noun chunk
GQ	generalized quantifier
IR	irrealis marker
LA	Lebanese Arabic
LCA	linear correspondence axiom
LF	logical form
Lit.	literally
MAS.	masculine marker
MAX _d	maximal degree
MP	the Minimalist Program
N	the Noun head
Nm	the Numeral-Classifier chunk
NmN	the Numeral-Classifier-Noun chunk
NOM	Nominative Case
NP	Noun Phrase
Num	the Numeral head
NumP	Numeral Phrase
NUN	modifier marker in Korean
Op	operator
0-Op	null operator
PF	phonetic form

PG	parasitic gap
PL	plural marker
P&P	principles and parameters
Prog	progressive marker
QP	quantifier phrase
QR	quantifier raising
RC	relative clause
REFL	reflexive pronoun
Rel ⁰	the Relative head
Rel-Con	relative construction
Relpro	relative pronoun
RelM	relative marker
RelP	Relative Phrase
R-expression	referential expression
RP	resumptive pronoun
SA	Standard Arabic
SC	small clause
SCO	strong cross-over
SFP	sentence-final particle
SG	singular marker
sm	weakly quantified <i>some</i>
SOME	strongly quantified <i>some</i>
Spec	Specifier
SS	S-structure
TO	a C ⁰ in Japanese
TOP	topic marker
UG	universal grammar
UQ	universal quantifier

Preface

It is a well-known fact that relative clauses are found in almost all languages including Chinese (Comrie, 1989) and it has been a hotly debated issue for quite a long time what is the best way to describe the function of relative clauses, the relationship between the head nominal phrase and the relative clause, and the structure of relative clause constructions. When the Generative-Transformational Grammar came into being, a new dimension was added the debate, namely, the best way to derive the relative clause constructions.

The main goal of the Generative-Transformation enterprise is to find out what the intrinsic principles are that underlie the syntactic and semantic relationship of various elements in a linguistic construction. A fundamental assumption of this endeavor is that the surface shape of a given construction may vary significantly in different languages but its internal structure is limited to a few variations or is the same across the board, since the grammar of different languages is derived from the same Universal Grammar. In the case of relative clause construction, the assumption is that various types of actual forms, no matter head-initial, head-final or head-internal, are the surface realizations of the same basic structure. Accordingly, the study on the relative clause construction of a particular language usually concentrates on its derivation or computation process rather than on its underlying structure.

The relative clause construction in Chinese is often referred to as the *de* construction by Chinese linguists because of the marker *de* that is its main morphological marker, even though the term is more general in the sense that *de* constructions include other modifiers of nominal phrases as well as the possessive construction, both of which are marked with *de*. From the early days of the generative grammar on, the Chinese

de construction has been one of the hot topics of research and a sizable literature has been generated (e. g., Tang, 1975; Huang, 1982; Li, 1990; Chiu, 1993; Wu, 2004). During the Standard Theory and the Government and Binding period of the Parameter and Principle Theory, a common practice is to assume that the relative clause is a modifier of the head nominal phrase, that the head nominal phrase is related to a position inside the relative clause and that *de* is an integrated part of the relative clause. Within the framework of the Minimalist Program, it is often assumed that the relative clause construction is a DP in which the complement is a CP. The head of the DP is assumed to be either an empty D or the marker *de*. In the former case, the marker *de* is the head of the CP while in the latter case the head of the CP is an empty category. In both cases, the head nominal phrase of the relative construction is assumed to be merged externally as a constituent of the IP under the CP and to be merged internally to its final position during computation. The final position of the head nominal phrase is assumed to be either the Spec of DP or an adjunct site of the DP.

Most of the technical differences reflect the theory-internal considerations of these analyses, depending on which model the researcher subscribes to, such as that of Chomsky (1973, 1977, 1981) or Kayne (1994). They also reflect the empirical considerations of these analyses, depending on what linguistic data the analysis is based on and which empirical evidence the researcher chooses to present. The empirical considerations usually cover the syntactic, semantic and even pragmatic relationship between the head nominal phrase and the relative clause, or to put it in a slightly different way, the relationship between *de*, the nominal phrase that is after *de* and the relative clause that is before *de*. Sometimes these two types of consideration would lead to conflicting approaches or contradictory conclusions, and researchers have to prioritize their concerns to find an optimal solution.

A fundamental principle underlying the choice of approach is that the basis of analysis should be the meaning of the linguistic construction in question. No matter what the framework is or what the technical de-

tails are, the main objective of a syntactic analysis is to correctly and accurately represent the meaning, which is encoded in the syntactic structure of the construction and the syntactic relation of its constituents. The actual analysis may take different paths or make various assumptions based on a particular theoretic framework, but the starting point is always the meaning of every individual element inside the construction, the meaning of all intermediate level constituents and the meaning of the whole construction. The framework being used may have an elaborate array of techniques and procedures, but these are just tools for analyzing the meaning and should not be mistaken to be the goal or the objectives of the analysis.

This book by Dr. Zongli Chen is the latest attempt to analyze the Chinese relative clause construction, namely, the *de* construction, in the spirit of Kayne (1994). He has conducted a thorough investigation of the relevant phenomena found in other languages as well as on the evolution of the framework and techniques since the mid-nineties, and thus laid down a solid theoretic foundation for the analysis. He has avoided the criticism often levied on works done in the framework of Generative-Transformational grammar by collecting an impressive range of data and staying away from controversial examples that are made up by the investigator themselves but are never found in real communication. This obvious advantage makes his analysis much more convincing. I am sure that readers can benefit tremendously from this work, learning the state of the arts theory of formal syntax and seeing how the theory can be applied to the study of Chinese grammar.

It is fashionable nowadays to discuss the notion of adopting the international academic standard but the idea will remain an abstract concept if we do not practice it. Dr. Chen has made his contribution to the realization of the ideal and I do hope that many more will follow.

Dingxu Shi

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University October 2007

References:

- Chiu, Bonnie. 1993. *The Inflectional Structure of Mandarin Chinese*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. "Conditions on Transformations." In *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. Andersen, Stephen and Paul Kiparsky. pp. 32 - 286. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- . 1977. "On Wh-Movement." In *Formal Syntax*, eds. Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian, pp. 71 - 132. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Huang, Cheng-Teh James. 1982. *Logic Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Li, Audrey. 1990. Order and constituency in Mandarin Chinese. *Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers*.
- Tang, Ting-chi C. 1975. "Contrastive Studies of Chinese and English Relativization". *The Concentric* 1975, 38 - 46.
- Wu, Xiu-zhi Zoe. 2004. *Grammaticalization and Language Change in Chinese: A Formal View*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon.

Introduction

The restrictive relative construction (i. e. Rel-Con) has been a hotly discussed topic in the generative literature. Among the various approaches proposed to account for its derivation and interpretation, the two prevailing ones are the Adjunction Analysis and the Raising Analysis. Arguing that neither of them is optimal considering the ‘explanatory adequacy’ requirement and the minimalist spirit, the author of the present study proposes a new analysis—the RelP Analysis—and argues that this analysis provides a more reasonable account of the derivation and the interpretation of Rel-Cons found in typologically different languages.

In the RelP Analysis, a Rel-Con is structurally a RelP or its extended projection (DP, GenP or NumP). In a RelP, the Rel⁰ head carries an uninterpretable [+Rel] feature that has to be checked by a nominal or degree element (i. e. the relative head), which is either merged in or moved to Spec RelP, and the complement of the Rel⁰ (i. e. the relative clause; the RC) can be any type of predicate (i. e. CP, TP, *v*P, PP, AdjP etc.). Theoretically, this analysis meets with the minimalist spirit, as it employs no operation other than Merge and Move. Empirically, it captures the fact that some types of Rel-Cons (i. e. those where the relative head is interpreted as an argument or a semi-argument within the RC) exhibit properties of movement while others (i. e. those where the relative head is interpreted as an adjunct in the RC or a floppy nominal) do not. Moreover, it is proposed that the Rel⁰ head denotes the connective marker ‘~’ or the Boolean operator AND; thus, the syntax of a Rel-Con is directly translated into its semantics, i. e., it denotes the intersection of the two sets denoted by the relative head and the RC respectively.

When the RelP Analysis is applied to account for the structure and interpretation of the Rel-Cons in different languages, we will find that

the syntactic and semantic variations with respect to the different forms of RCs can all be predicted and well accounted for. The author proposes that the specificity property of a Rel-Con is determined by the relativized element, while the form of the Rel-Con is determined by both the relativized element and the properties of the RC. Specifically, when the relativized element is a degree phrase (DegP), the Rel-Con would contain no relative pronoun (RelPro) or resumptive pronoun (RP) and it is interpreted as a non-specific constituent. When the relativized element is a DP, the Rel-Con would be specific and its form is determined by whether the RC is a CP and the specification of the [wh] feature in the C⁰ head. When it is not a CP, the Rel-Con can only have a gap or an RP as its relative marker; when it is a CP with a [+wh] C⁰ head, the Rel-Con would contain a (*wh*-form) RelPro; when it is a CP with a [-wh] C⁰, the Rel-Con would contain an overt or covert RP. Languages vary with respect to the following factors: the [\pm wh] feature in C⁰ and relative D (D_{rel}), the overt/covert realization of the RP, and the possibility of relativizing from a topicalized element. As to the linear order between the RC and the relative head, it is proposed that the RC preceding the relative head is moved to Spec DP or Spec GenP while the RC following the relative head moves covertly. The landing site of the RC is determined by the kind of predicate it belongs to. Individual-level RCs raise to Spec DP, while stage-level RCs raise to Spec GenP.

This book is a modified version of my Ph.D. Dissertation. I am deeply indebted to the professors in the National Center for Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, who have helped me acquire an understanding of the various aspects of linguistics. Particularly, I owe my supervisor Prof. Wen Binli an enormous amount of gratitude. His encouragement and guidance have made this task less torturing, and working with him has been a tremendous learning experience.

I am also thankful to the members of my dissertation Committee: Prof. Shi Dingxu, Prof. Cheng Gong, Prof. Liang Jinxiang, Prof. He Xiaowei, and Doc. Wang Wenxin, all of them have provided helpful

comments and suggestions.

This book could not have been possible without the fruitful discussions with Audrey Li, Tanya Reinhart, Yeal Shavit, Shi Dingxu and Tang Sze-Wing. It could have nowhere to get had it not been for the books and articles generously sent or e-mailed to me by David Adger, Artemis Alexiadou, Cedric Beockx, Rejash Bhatt, Valentina Bianchi, Hagit Borer, Guelielmo Cinque, Hamida Demirdache, Veneeta Dayal, Kleanthes Grohmann, Alexander Grosu, Janne Johannessen, Lin Ruo-Wang, Georges Rebuschi, Yeal Shavit, Margaret Suñer, Michael Tremblay, Mark de Vries, and Roberto Zamparelli. A big THANK YOU is far from sufficient to express my gratitude to them.

Finally, thanks also go to my family and friends, especially my wife Wang Hengying, for their patience and understanding during those ‘frying days’ of writing and rewriting the dissertation.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	1
Preface	1
Introduction	1
Chapter One Introductory Remarks	1
1.1 <i>Why Study the Relative Construction?</i>	1
1.1.1 Theory-driven	1
1.1.2 Interest-driven	2
1.2 <i>The Aims and Scope of This Study</i>	4
1.2.1 The Aims of the Study	4
1.2.2 The Scope of the Study	4
1.2.2.1 Type of Semantic Relation between the RC and the Head Noun	5
1.2.2.2 Hierarchical Status of the RC	5
1.2.2.3 Presence or Absence of a Head	5
1.2.2.4 Hierarchical Status of the Head	6
1.2.2.5 Linear Order between Head and RC	6
1.2.2.6 Presence or Absence of an RP	6
1.2.2.7 Element in the Comp Area	7
1.2.2.8 Finiteness of the RC	8
1.3 <i>Organization of the Book</i>	8

Chapter Two	Towards the Derivation of Rel-Cons	11
2.1	<i>Introduction</i>	11
2.2	<i>Reviewing the Two Mainstream Analyses</i>	13
2.2.1	<i>Their Main Ideas</i>	13
2.2.1.1	<i>The Adjunction Analysis</i>	13
2.2.1.2	<i>The Raising Analysis</i>	15
2.2.2	<i>Evaluating the Two Analyses</i>	16
2.2.2.1	<i>Evaluating the Adjunction Analysis</i>	16
2.2.2.2	<i>Evaluating the Raising Analysis</i>	25
2.3	<i>Our Proposal</i>	47
2.4	<i>Conclusion</i>	51
Chapter Three	Elaborating the RelP Analysis	53
3.1	<i>Introduction</i>	53
3.2	<i>The Licensing of the Relative Relation</i>	54
3.3	<i>Justifying the Head Raising Process</i>	57
3.3.1	<i>Counter-arguments against Head Raising</i>	58
3.3.1.1	<i>The Trigger for Raising</i>	58
3.3.1.2	<i>The Nature of the Raised Constituent</i>	58
3.3.1.3	<i>The Nature of ‘Who’, ‘Whom’, ‘When’, ‘Where’ and ‘Why’</i>	59
3.3.1.4	<i>The Doubly-filled Comp Filter</i>	60
3.3.1.5	<i>The Constituency Problems</i>	60
3.3.1.6	<i>Coordination Facts</i>	62
3.3.1.7	<i>Reconstruction Asymmetry</i>	62
3.3.2	<i>Evaluating the Counter-arguments</i>	63
3.3.2.1	<i>The Motivation for Raising</i>	64
3.3.2.2	<i>The Nature of the Raised Constituent</i>	64
3.3.2.3	<i>The Nature of ‘Who’, ‘Whom’, ‘When’, ‘Where’ and ‘Why’</i>	65

3.3.2.4	The Doubly-filled Comp Filter Effect	66
3.3.2.5	The Constituency Problems	68
3.3.2.6	Coordination Facts	75
3.3.2.7	Reconstruction	77
3.4	<i>The Categorical Status of the RC</i>	79
3.4.1	The Status of \emptyset -RCs	79
3.4.2	The Status of Reduced RCs	80
3.4.3	A Theoretical Point of View	82
3.5	<i>Conclusion</i>	83
Chapter Four	The RelP Analysis and Head-Initial Rel-Cons	85
4.1	<i>Introduction</i>	85
4.2	<i>Accounting for Hebrew Rel-Cons</i>	88
4.2.1	Preliminary Facts	88
4.2.1.1	Relativizable Elements and Forms of Rel-Cons	88
4.2.1.2	Interpretational Differences between Rel-Cons of Different Forms	93
4.2.2	The Nature of 'ʔasher'	95
4.2.3	The Nature and Properties of RPs	97
4.2.3.1	The Classification of RPs	98
4.2.3.2	The Nature of Intrusive Pronouns —Spelling Out of Traces	101
4.2.3.3	The Nature of RPs— Derivational Residues	103
4.2.4	The Derivation and Interpretation of Hebrew Rel-Cons	111
4.2.4.1	The Raising of RPs	112
4.2.4.2	Accounting for the Interpretational Differences	115

4.2.5	Summary	118
4.3	<i>Accounting for English Rel-Cons</i>	119
4.3.1	Recapitulating the Basic Facts	119
4.3.2	Properties of Rel-Cons Related to the Relative Markers	121
4.3.2.1	Rel-Cons Disallowing Relpros	121
4.3.2.2	Rel-Cons Allowing Relpros	123
4.3.3	The Derivation of Different Rel-Cons	125
4.3.3.1	The Derivation of the Rel-Cons Disallowing Relpros	125
4.3.3.2	The Derivation of Rel-Cons Compatible with a Relpro	131
4.3.4	Accounting for the Interpretational Differences	135
4.3.4.1	Analyses in the Literature	136
4.3.4.2	Arguing against the Analyses	138
4.3.4.3	Our Analysis	139
4.3.4.4	Evidence Supporting Our Analysis	141
4.3.5	Summary	143
4.4	<i>Conclusion</i>	145
Chapter Five The RelP Analysis and Head-Final Rel-Cons		147
5.1	<i>Introduction</i>	147
5.2	<i>The Restrictiveness of RCs</i>	151
5.2.1	The 'Internal-RC-as-non-restrictive' Analysis	152
5.2.2	The 'External-RC-as-non- restrictive' Analysis	153
5.2.3	The 'Both-restrictive' Analysis	155
5.2.4	Discussion	156
5.3	<i>The Structure and Interpretation of Chinese Rel-Cons</i>	159