

程 工 / 主编

解放军外国语学院英语博士文库

# A Minimalist Approach to Long-distance Reflexives

程 工 著

远程反身代词的最简方案研究

河南大学出版社

Monographs by Ph.D Holders,  
English Department, PLA UFL

H042  
C742

程 工 / 主编

解放军外国语学院英语博士文库

# A Minimalist Approach to Long-distance Reflexives

程 工 著

远程反身代词的最简方案研究

河南大学出版社

Monographs by Ph.D Holders,  
English Department, PLA UFL



\*20030840\*

## 前 言

根据指称的特点,生成语法的标准理论把自然语言中的名词性成分划分为照应语、(普通)代词和指称语三个类别。照应语主要包括反身代词和相互代词两种类型,完全没有独立指称,只能照应句中特定的其他某个成分;指称语有独立的指称,不能照应句中其他任何成分;代词介于照应语和指称语之间,可以然而不必照应句中的其他成分。普遍语法中有一个原则子系统,即约束理论,负责规定这三类词语在指称中所必须遵守的条件。其中,第一约束原则规定照应语必须在局部区域之内(通常是本小句或者是含领属语的名词短语之内)得到约束。然而,在相当多的语言里,被认为是反身代词的成分经常在其所处的局部区域之外受到约束,具有所谓的“远程约束”(long-distance binding, 又译为“远距离约束”)现象。这一现象不仅使它们与英语反身代词形成对立,而且对标准的约束理论构成了至少表面上的反例。正因为如此,远程反身代词成了国际语言学界相关研究中重要的热点与焦点之一。

在汉语中,“自己”一词通常被认定为反身代词。与英语等语言中的反身代词相比,“自己”有一系列独特的表现:第一,它具有远程约束能力,即可以在本局部区域之外受到约束;第二,它在先行词的选择上具有“主语倾向性”,即一般照应主语,不照应宾语;第三,它可以得到“次统治(sub-command)”约束,



即当主语的中心词是个无生命的NP而主语的领属语是有生命的NP时,该领属语可以约束“自己”,如“[张三的骄傲]害了自己”;第四,在一定程度上,它的约束具有“阻断效应(blocking effect)”,即只有当所有的先行词在人称和数量特征上保持一致时,对“自己”的远程约束才能实现;第五,在分布上,它可以出现在时态句主语和名词短语领属语等英语反身代词不能出现的位置上;第六,在用法上,它既有照应和强调用法,也有其他语言反身代词所没有的泛指用法。这些特性表明:“自己”与英语等其他语言反身代词的差异是系统性的。正因为如此,它对普遍语法的研究,尤其是约束理论的研究,具有独特的价值,对了解汉语语法的特性及其与普遍语法的关系也具有重要的启示意义。

近20多年来,生成语法研究者尝试了不少途径,提出了很多方案,以期捕捉“自己”的特性。他们有的认为“自己”是一个独特的词语,属于“照应性代词”,受独立的约束原则制约;有的认为“自己”与其他语言反身代词的差异是普遍语法原则不同参数化所造成的结果;有的认为“自己”在抽象的逻辑式层次经历隐性的移位,逐层嫁接到与上层各主语邻近的位置,以此从各个主语获得指称,从而形成远程约束现象;还有的认为“自己”和英语反身代词对先行词有不同的选择:“自己”选择中心词为先行词,而英语反身代词选择词组层次的先行词,从而导致了两者局部区域的差异,最终形成了远程约束现象。除此之外,语义学和语用学的研究者也从不同的视角、以不同的理论框架对“自己”一词的特性提出了极具深度的解释。上述理论虽然相互之间存在很大差别,但在一些基本假设上却相当一致。第一,它们都一致认为“自己”是一个纯粹的反身代词,在理论上和英语反身代词没有差别,有区别的或者是各自语言局部区域的范围,或者是各自的形态特性;第二,它们普遍断定“自己”是一个形态简单的词语,或者说“单语素反身代词”,与之对立的英语反身代词则是形态复杂的复合词。

然而,正如很多研究者所指出的那样,在上述假设基础上建立起来的分析都存在这样或那样的不足与缺陷。它们或者不能很好地解释“自己”与其他语言的差异,不符合普遍语法理论所具有的普遍性;或者不足以完整反映“自己”的特性,甚至多有背离事实之处。

本书以最简方案为理论框架,提出了一个与现有研究迥然有别的解释性分析。它的体系完备,内容丰富,主要由以下几个部分组成:

第一,提出了一个鉴别反身代词的标准。本书认为,无论管约论还是最简论期间的标准约束理论都有一个致命的不足,即缺乏鉴别反身代词的标准。这一不足导致研究者往往只以指称特点作为区别反身代词和代词的惟一依据,把能在局部区域之内受到约束的词语处理为反身代词,反之则为代词。这种鉴别方法有同语反复的弊端,也很难应用于各种不同的语言(如汉语中的“自己”)。为此,本书综合前人研究的成果,以跨语言事实为依据,提出:只有同时满足以下两个标准的名词性成分才是反身代词:(1)“最简性”,或者是形态的最简性,即只有一个语素,没有任何性、数和人称特征的屈折变化;或者是指称上的最简性,即有完备的屈折特征,与先行词在性、数和人称特征上完全一致。(2)“照应和强调用法的重叠”,即必须兼有照应和强调两种用法,并只有这两种用法。

第二,对“自己”一词的性质进行了重新定位。得出了四条结论:(1)根据汉语本族语素多为单音节,“自”和“己”在古代汉语独立使用、在现代汉语依然可以独立构词等事实,并参照上述鉴别反身代词的两个标准,断定“自己”是双语素复合词,而不是单语素、纯粹的反身代词,因此与英语反身代词不具备理论的同—性。(2)根据对《左传》中“自”和“己”句法性质的定量分析,断定“自”符合反身代词的标准,“己”则是一个普通代词。(3)根据 Williams (1981)所提“右手中心词规则”和汉

语语序的普遍特点,断定“自己”的中心词是“己”,而不是“自”。

(4) 根据语法化理论,断定“自”和“己”仅因为音系原因而复合,因而融合度低,在“自己”的语义诠释和句法分布上,两者可以独立发挥作用。换言之,本书认为,“自己”一词复杂的表象来源于“自”和“己”各自的特性和词语复合的一般规律,“自己”与英语反身代词的差异是词汇性的,而不是由语言全局性的差异造成的。

第三,阐明了“自己”的内部结构和形式特征。依据上述结论,同时根据 DP 假说和光杆短语结构理论,提出“自己”的内部结构为 $[_{DP} [_D \text{ 自}] [_D \text{ 己}]]$ 。“自己”主要有三个形式特征,分别是来源于“自”的[附加性]和[照应性],以及来源于“己”的[代词性]。其中[附加性]和[照应性]是逻辑式不可诠释特征,需要通过移位得到核查并消除,而[代词性]是可诠释特征,不需核查。

第四,提出了一个分析反身代词的新方案。它主要以最简方案框架中复制约束理论和移动特征理论为基础。按照这个新方案,“自己”中来源于“自”的[附加性]特征因为需要核查,所以隐性提升并嫁接到靠它最近的功能语类 T (时态) 节点上,与 T 所含的相关特征对照以得到消除。[附加性]在移位时连带[照应性]特征一起上移,并与 T 的标志语(通常为句子的主语)建立核查关系,通过与它对照而得到消除,由此获得局部性指称。与此同时,来源于“己”的[代词性]无需而且不能移位,留在原有的位置,赋予了“自己”所表现出的代词性特征,如远程约束、自由分布和泛指用法等。本书还提出了一个“容忍准则”,规定词语某个次要成分(如非中心词或修饰语)的不可诠释特征即使得不到消除,推导也可以容忍而不至于崩溃。该准则解释了“自己”分布的自由性,这是因为,“自”不是“自己”的中心成分,所以它的不可诠释特征即使因无法移出而得不到核查,推导也可容忍,并依据中心词“己”的特征对整个复合词进行诠释。这样,“自己”就可以分布在孤岛等某些其他反身代词不能出现的语境

中。对“自己”的这—种分析途径似乎也—样适用于对朝语、日语等语言中的远程反身代词。

本书同时假设，英语反身代词与“自己”—样是复合词，而且也有[附加性]、[照应性]和[代词性]等形式特征，并遵守相同的核查程序和相同的句法限制。不同之处—主要与融合度和中心词选择有关。首先，英语反身代词是由代词加上表示强调/对比的形容词词缀(“self”)形成的组合，经长期的历史演化已经与普通代词形成明确而严格的分工，因此具有极高的融合度，其中的代词性成分已不能单独指称，所以英语反身代词在整体上不具有远程约束能力。其次，“self”是它的中心词而非次要成分，所以它不可诠释的形式特征全部需要通过移位得到核查并消除掉。因此，英语反身代词不能出现在孤岛语境中，分布限制要比“自己”严格得多。

在上述研究的基础上，本书还探讨了跨语言差异的范围问题，指出：正如 Chomsky 所言，语言的计算系统不可变异，所有语言均遵守相同的句法操作和句法限制。词库中可以出现哪些特征也由普遍语法决定，也不可变异。可能变异部分仅只与词汇的形态有关，本书讨论的主要包括三个：特征选择(即哪些特征在构词时被组合到某个特定的词语)、成分之间的融合度、中心词选择(即哪个成分被选择为中心词)。然而，本书并不支持时下广泛流行的一个观点，即跨语言之间的所有差异均可归结为功能语类的强度值，认为这一观点不符合远程反身代词所表现出的特点。此外，本书还总结出了本研究对语言共性研究的四条蕴涵：

(1) 语言共性研究不能等同于寻找语言之间具体的对应物；(2) 应更加重视派生形态(即构词法)以及它与句法接口的研究；(3) 语言历史事实对跨语言比较研究具有宝贵的借鉴意义；(4) 应更加重视句法学和语用学的分工与合作。

程 工

2004 年 6 月

### List of Abbreviations

ABS	absolutive case marker
ACC	accusative case marker
AdvP	adverbial phrase
AGR	agreement
AgrP	agreement phrase
AP	adjectival phrase
A-P	articulatory-perceptual
ASP	aspectual marker
C-I	conceptual-intensional
CFC	complex functional complex
COM	complementizer
CP	Complementizer Phrase
DAT	dative case marker
DE	a bound morpheme in Chinese capable of three uses: a genitive marker, a modifier marker, a relative clause marker
DP	determiner phrase
DS	D-structure
DUR	an adverbial morpheme marking duration
ECP	Empty Category Principle
EMPH	emphatic marker
Excl.	exclamation marker
F	feature



---

GB	government and binding
GC	<i>governing category</i>
GEN	genitive case marker
IL	interface level
Inf	infinitival clause marker
I(Infl)	inflection
LF	logical form
LOC	locative case marker
MP	minimalist program
NOM	nominative case marker
NP	noun phrase (nominal phrase)
O	object
P&P	principles and parameters
PF	phonetic form
PLD	primary linguistic data
PP	prepositional (postpositional) phrase
Pred	predicate marker
Q	question marker
QR	quantifier raising
Rel	relative clause marker
SD	structural description
SPEC	specifier
SS	S-structure
Subj	subject
TOP	topic marker
TP	Tense Phrase
UG	universal grammar
VP	verb phrase (verbal phrase)

## Contents

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b>	( 1 )
1.0 Preliminary Remarks	( 1 )
1.1 General Framework	( 4 )
1.2 GB and MP Versions	(12)
1.3 The Minimalist View on Variation	(23)
1.4 The Standard Binding Theory	(33)
1.5 An Outline of the Present Study	(42)
1.6 Organization of the Book	(44)
<b>Chapter 2 Basic Data</b>	(47)
2.0 Preliminary Remarks	(47)
2.1 <i>Ziji</i> in Chinese	(49)
2.2 [ <i>Pronoun + Ziji</i> ] Constructions	(66)
2.3 Long-distance Reflexives in Other Languages	(72)
2.4 Conclusion	(82)
<b>Chapter 3 Literature Review</b>	(85)
3.0 Preliminary Remarks	(85)

3.1	Modifying the Typology of DPs .....	(87)
3.2	The Parameterization Approach .....	(93)
3.3	The LF-movement Analysis .....	(99)
3.4	The Semantic Approach .....	(109)
3.5	Yan Huang's Pragmatic Theory .....	(113)
3.6	Conclusion .....	(124)
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>Properties of <i>Ziji</i></b> .....	<b>(128)</b>
4.0	Preliminary Remarks .....	(128)
4.1	On the Distinction Between Reflexives and Pronominals .....	(129)
4.2	On the Nature of <i>Ziji</i> .....	(145)
4.3	<i>Zi</i> in Archaic Chinese .....	(151)
4.4	<i>Ji</i> in Archaic Chinese .....	(157)
4.5	A New View on <i>Ziji</i> .....	(163)
4.6	Further Evidence: the Case of <i>Huxiang</i> .....	(171)
4.7	Conclusion .....	(176)
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>A Minimalist Account</b> .....	<b>(178)</b>
5.0	Preliminary Remarks .....	(178)
5.1	The Internal Structure of <i>Ziji</i> .....	(180)
5.2	Features of <i>Ziji</i> .....	(186)
5.3	Derivation of <i>Ziji</i> at LF .....	(189)
5.4	The Analysis of Data .....	(195)
5.5	Reflexives in Other Languages .....	(208)
5.6	Notes on Some Theoretical Issues .....	(214)
5.7	Comparison with Existing Accounts .....	(221)
5.8	Conclusion .....	(224)

---

<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Conclusions and Implications</b>	(225)
6.0	Preliminary Remarks	(225)
6.1	Major Findings	(225)
6.2	Implications for Crosslinguistic Variations	(236)
6.3	Conclusion	(248)
<b>References</b>		(249)
后记		(260)

# **Chapter 1**

## **Introduction**

### **1.0 Preliminary Remarks**

Languages present a fascinating paradox. On the one hand, they vary in infinite ways; on the other, they manifest an amazing set of features suggesting there may be common properties that pertain to them all. As a mirror image, linguists always divide into two camps: the particularists who tend to emphasize the diversity of languages, and the universalists who emphasize uniformity and regularity. Representing the former group is the view that “language is a human activity that varies without assignable limit” (Whitney 1874), and that “languages could differ from each other without limit and in unpredictable ways” (Joos 1957: 96). Typical of the view among the universalist camp is that “underlying the endless and fascinating idiosyncrasies of the world’s languages there are uniformities of universal scope”, and that “languages are cut to the same pattern” (Greenberg 1966: XV).

There is, in fact, no lack of agreement between the two views. No universalist is blind to the variations in languages, both

diachronic and typological, that are perceptible to the most casual and superficial observation; similarly, few linguists who hold the particularist view deny there are common properties across languages. What sets the two camps apart is the difference in emphasis and orientation. Generally speaking, those who are primarily oriented to the formal properties, and whose approach is essentially logical or philosophical, tend to stress the universal side of language, whereas those that are semantic in orientation and rooted in rhetoric and ethnography are more inclined to stress the variability among languages. This was true of the Stoics in ancient Greece around the 4th century B.C. who debated whether languages are — to use the historians' tag — analogic or anomalous. The analogists saw language in terms of order and regularity, while the anomalists saw it as far more haphazard, particularly in the domain of meaning. It is also true of contemporary linguistics, with most formal grammarians preoccupied with the search for linguistic universals and most functionalists explicitly attending to the idiosyncrasies.

In contemporary linguistics, the best-known universalist theory is generative grammar which suggests that language is biologically determined to be largely the same for all human beings, as a property of the initial state of the language faculty. This initial state is constituted of the principles of language connected to a finite set of parameters whose values are set on the basis of the very limited information that is available to the child. This "Principles-and-Parameters" approach, as it has been called, has quickly risen to prominence and has proven highly successful, leading to many exciting discoveries.

In more recent years, a fairly significant amount of work in



generative grammar converges to ascertaining the range of grammatical domains that may be affected by parametric variation, which is a technical term for crosslinguistic differences. The central theme may be stated as follows:

(1) Which aspects of language are open to parametric variation?

The present book relates to such a theme. In subsequent discussions, I shall juxtapose parametric variation with issues of the so-called “long-distance reflexives”, that is, reflexives that can be bound by an antecedent outside the local domain that contains them, in contradistinction to “local reflexives”, such as those in English, which are strictly bound within its local domain. The existence of long-distance reflexives is quite widespread crosslinguistically, with ramifications that are rather puzzling from the perspective of the binding theory in its standard form. One such element that has received extensive attention is *ziji* in Chinese. This word has become the database for many proposed parameters and particularistic theories (see Chapter 3 for details). By contrast, we will present a unified account of Chinese and other languages in this specific area, which we believe is superior to all the alternative accounts on both conceptual and empirical grounds. As such, no parameter is needed, let alone the particularistic assumptions that there is a typological difference or even unbridgeable gap between Chinese and some other languages. Moreover, evidence from the present research substantiates the emerging idea that parametric variation is localized to the lexicon, shedding new light on our understanding of the central theme in the recent research on universal grammar, as stated in (1).

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the background information, basic concepts and the general framework that presuppose discussions in the rest of the book. The more technical notions will be postponed until we come to the analytic parts.

## **1.1 General Framework**

### **1.1.1 Chomskyan theory**

The present study falls into the research paradigm that is typically worked out by linguists and researchers in adjacent fields who work within the “Principles-and-Parameters” model of generative grammar. However, it has always been problematic to devise an appropriate covering term for those who sponsor the view. “Generative grammar” is too loose a label: any grammar is generative if it adopts the requirement that grammars have to be perfectly explicit. As pointed out by Newmeyer (1983), Hockett (1955), for example, incorporates a finite-state (and thus generative) grammar into his linguistic theory without advocating any of the basic assumptions that later characterized Chomsky’s work. Even if it is understood in the popular sense as a tradition that was initiated by Chomsky’s *Syntactic Structures* in 1957, one will find that it has split into a number of divergent and frequently contradictory views.

Another commonly used, yet erroneous name is “GB theory”, where the letters stand for “government” and “binding”, two of the most important subsystems of universal grammar (UG) in Chomsky’s (1981) conception. There are various reasons for rejecting the term (see, for example, Chomsky (1991a) for

discussion). The most important reason, at least to my mind, is that GB is at most a stage in the theorization of UG, and furthermore, that stage is being outmoded, especially with the introduction of the Minimalist Program by Chomsky (1993, 1995, 1998, 1999, 2001) in which the notion “government” is discarded (cf. Section 1.2.4). Therefore, the term “GB”, with its various associated concepts, like “GB grammarians” or “GB theory” will be disengaged from the UG theory under discussion.

It seems that the only alternative available in the existing literature is “Chomskyan (Chomskian)”, a term that is derived from Noam Chomsky, founder of generative grammar and the best-known figure among those who advocate and defend the UG theory we are to outline. However, Chomsky (1991a: 3) himself finds the term objectionable for two reasons: first, “to the extent that a subject is significant enough and worth pursuing, it is not personalized; and I think that the questions we are addressing are significant and worth pursuing”; second, the UG theory has been “a cooperative enterprise” in every stage of development.

In this book, I shall, despite Chomsky’s objection, keep to the term “Chomskyan”, as no alternative designation comes to mind that has equal simplicity and greater accuracy. More specifically, it is used in essentially Botha’s (1989: 9) sense to refer to the conception of language “guided by questions about the nature, origin and use of knowledge of language, fundamental amongst which is the problem of language acquisition”. In other words, Chomskyan linguistics is a study of the mental representations of linguistic knowledge. In this sense, it is a branch of (cognitive) psychology, and, ultimately, biology.

The Chomskyan view in Botha’s sense has to be distinguished