

基于体特征和致使关系的 英语动结式事件结构研究

袁毅敏◎著

An Aspectual-Causal Event Structure Account of
English Resultative Constructions



电子科技大学出版社

基于体特征和致使关系的

英语动结式事件结构研究

袁毅敏◎著

JIYU TITEZHENG HE ZHISHI GUANXI DE
YINGYU DONGJIESHI SHIJIAN JIEGOU YANJIU



电子科技大学出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

基于体特征和致使关系的英语动结式事件结构研究 /
袁毅敏著. —成都: 电子科技大学出版社, 2015. 12

ISBN 978-7-5647-3400-8

I. ①基… II. ①袁… III. ①英语—句法—研究
IV. ①H314.3

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2015) 第 301001 号

基于体特征和致使关系的英语动结式事件结构研究

An Aspectual-Causal Event Structure Account
of English Resultative Constructions

袁毅敏 著

出 版: 电子科技大学出版社 (成都市一环路东一段 159 号电子信息产
业大厦 邮编: 610051)

策划编辑: 谢应成

责任编辑: 徐 波

主 页: www.uestcp.com.cn

电子邮箱: uestcp@uestcp.com.cn

发 行: 新华书店经销

印 刷: 成都市火炬印务有限公司

成品尺寸: 140 mm×203mm 印张 8.25 字数 215 千字

版 次: 2015 年 12 月第一版

印 次: 2015 年 12 月第一次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978-7-5647-3400-8

定 价: 26.00 元

■ 版权所有 侵权必究 ■

◆ 本社发行部电话: 028-83202463; 本社邮购电话: 028-83201495。

◆ 本书如有缺页、破损、装订错误, 请寄回印刷厂调换。

序

《基于体特征和致使关系的英语动结式事件结构研究》是作者基于博士论文的研究成果。英语动结式有特别的句法语义特征,如主谓语与主语的关系、主谓语与宾语的关系、主谓语与第二谓语的关系,以及第二谓语与主语的关系。对这些特征的探究能够为句法-语义界面研究的基本问题回答提供一定启示,例如:“动词语义能否影响句法?”“哪些语义成分能够影响句法?”等。

关于英语动结式的研究非常多,大体可以分为词汇意义驱动论、体特征驱动论和二者结合论三类。前两种思路孤立地探究动词的词汇意义或者体特征在句法-语义界面的作用,要么长于解释动结式中动词与其宾语的关系,而疏于探讨动词与结果短语之间的联系与互动,要么擅长解释动词与结果短语的关系,但不能解释动词对宾语的选择。也有研究将动词的词汇意义和体特征结合起来,但都不能够全面解释英语动结式的句法语义特点。

作者对英语动结式的句法语义特征作了全面深入的探讨,研究的一大亮点在于发现了动词的词汇意义和体特征之间的关联,提出了基于体特征和致使关系的事件结构模型:事件的“有界”标记或者度量物同时也是致使关系中的使事。这一模型能够解释动词包括动结式在内的多重论元实现现象:每个动词同时具有多个语义结构,因此在句法实现中,同一个动词在不同的句式中可以表现出不同的及物特征。基于此模型,作者对动词语义进行了深入探讨,将动词分为五大类和四小类。

作者研究的另一大亮点在于不仅分析了动词的体特征,还将体特征分析扩大到了形容词和介词,丰富了这两类词的语义内容。

根据“延续性”和“有界性”，英语形容词可以分为“无极形容词”，“右极值分级形容词”，“左极值分级形容词”，“开放类形容词”四类，英语介词可以分为“来源介词”，“目标介词”，“路径介词”，“循序介词”，“恒定介词”，“几何介词”和“循环介词”七类。

作者对英语动结式的研究具有一定的解释力，为动结式的语料库建设也做出了一定的贡献。在今后的研究中，可以考虑将研究对象从英语动结式扩大到英汉语言中所有表达致使意义的结构，揭示致使义的本质，建立致使事件语义语法系统；同时，在研究方法上，可以考虑将理论与实证研究结合起来，用实证研究验证理论框架的合理性，将实证研究中先进的实验方法用于理论构建。

楚 军

2015 年 11 月 6 日于电子科技大学

前 言

英语动结式因其特殊的句法-语义特征,在界面研究中广受关注。本研究旨在从体特征及致使关系角度对英语动结式进行事件结构分析,着重回答四个问题:第一,动结式中结果短语描述主语还是宾语?第二,为什么不及物动词可以在动结式中表现出及物特征?第三,为什么某些动词(如渐生题旨动词和表示表面接触的动词)在动结式中可以灵活选择宾语,而另一些动词(如状态变化动词)则只能搭配固定宾语?第四,动结式中动词与结果短语之间存在什么样的关系?

以往对英语动结式的研究大致可以分为三类:词汇意义驱动论、体特征驱动论和二者结合论。词汇意义驱动论认为动词的词汇意义是决定句法实现的关键。这类理论往往长于解释动结式中动词与其宾语的关系,而疏于探讨动词与结果短语之间的联系与互动。体特征驱动论认为动词的体特征是决定句法实现的关键。这类理论擅长解释动词与结果短语的关系,但不能解释动词对宾语的选择。也有研究将动词的词汇意义和体特征结合起来解释英语动结式,但都不能够全面地回答以上四个研究问题。

在以往研究的基础上,本研究提出了基于体特征和致使关系的事件结构模型。体特征包含“延续性”和“有界性”两方面;致使关系是动词的语义结构;同时,体特征与词汇语义之间存在关联:事件的“有界”标记或者度量物同时也是致使关系的终端。

基于体特征和致使关系的事件结构模型初步回答了关于英语动结式的四个研究问题。第一,无论描述主语还是宾语,结果短语都是使事受影响程度在句法层面的实现;第二,动词可以同时

具有多个语义结构，因此在句法实现中，同一个动词在不同的句式中可以表现出不同的及物特征；第三，虽然动词具有多个语义结构，但是每个语义结构的显著程度不同；在表达致使意义时，一些动词（如渐生题旨动词和表示表面接触的动词）允许不同语义结构进入句法语义投射，另一些动词（如状态变化动词）只允许显著程度最高的语义结构能够进入句法语义投射，因此两类动词在动结式中对宾语的选择表现出不同的灵活度；第四，动词与结果短语必须具有相同的体特征，即在“延续性”和“有界性”两方面保持一致。

全书共分五章。第一章介绍背景，提出研究问题；第二章综述文献；第三章提出基于体特征和致使关系的事件结构模型；第四章在此框架下分析英语动结式的句法语义特点，回答研究问题；第五章在前述结果的基础上概括研究结论。

通过探究英语动结式的句法-语义特征，本研究证明了动词的语义确实能够影响其句法特征，从一个角度回答了界面研究的基本问题。本研究仍存在不足之处，例如：基于致使关系和体特征的动词分类可能并不能全面囊括所有动词、研究中涉及的语料没有包括隐喻类动结式等。本研究可能在其它地方仍存在错谬之处，希望读者批评指正。

感谢我的博士导师林允清教授，在他的指导下，我完成了本研究；感谢本书的序言作者楚军教授，他为本研究提出了很多宝贵的建议；感谢出版社的谢应成老师和其他审稿老师为本书出版付出的精力；感谢我的家人对我的支持！

袁毅敏

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 English resultative constructions and research questions	1
1.2 Major approaches to English resultative constructions	7
1.3 A sketch of the aspectual-causal event structure	9
1.4 The organization of the dissertation	11
Chapter 2 Previous Studies of English Resultative Construction	13
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 The Syntax-Semantics Interface	14
2.2.1 Meaning-driven approach	17
2.2.1.1 Theta-grid	17
2.2.1.2 Event structure.....	18
2.2.1.3 Scalar/nonscalar change or manner/result complementary distribution.....	21
2.2.2 Aspect-driven approach	24
2.2.2.1 Aspect and Aktionsart.....	24
2.2.2.2 Aspectual interface hypothesis	29
2.2.3 Meaning-aspect-integrated approach	33
2.2.3.1 A scalar model	33
2.2.3.2 A three-dimensional model.....	37
2.3 Analysis of English resultative constructions in theories of meaning-driven approach	40
2.3.1 Goldberg (1995): a constructional analysis.....	40
2.3.2 Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004): a constructional event structure account.....	45

2.3.3	Levin and Rappaport: an event structure account	51
2.3.4	Levin and Rappaport: scalar/nonscalar property with resultatives	55
2.4	Analysis of English resultative constructions in theories of aspect-driven approach	57
2.4.1	Wechsler (2001, 2005): event-argument homomorphism model of telicity	57
2.4.2	Wyngaerd (2001): event measuring	63
2.5	Analysis of English resultative constructions in theories of meaning-aspect-integrated approach	66
2.6	Discussions	68
2.6.1	Comments on meaning-driven analysis	69
2.6.1.1	Comments on the constructional analysis	69
2.6.1.2	Comments on the analysis of event structure	72
2.6.1.3	Comments on the analysis of aspectually relevant lexical properties	73
2.6.2	Comments on aspect-driven analysis	75
2.6.2.1	Comments on Wechsler's homomorphism model	76
2.6.2.2	Comments on Wyngaerd's measuring event	78
2.6.3	Comments on meaning-aspect-integrated analysis	79
2.7	Summary	81
Chapter 3 An Aspectual-Causal Event Structure		84
3.1	Introduction	84
3.2	A general introduction to the aspectual-causal event structure	86
3.2.1	Research questions of event structure	86
3.2.2	The framework of the aspectual-causal event structure	88
3.3	The aspectual tier: Time-Space Hypothesis	90

3.4	The lexical tier: the lexicalized causal segment.....	93
3.4.1	Grounding studies	93
3.4.1.1	Types of causation	94
3.4.1.2	Causal segment and mapping model	96
3.4.2	The lexical structure of event.....	97
3.4.2.1	An extended classification of causation types	97
3.4.2.2	The lexical structure of event: the lexicalized causal segment.....	101
3.5	The connection and interaction of the two tiers.....	104
3.6	Event lexicalization and argument realization of English resultative constructions	111
3.6.1	The aspectual tier of event structure for English resultative constructions	111
3.6.2	The connection and interaction of two tiers in English resultative constructions	116
3.6.2.1	The constraint of the extended aspectual structure on the lexical structure	117
3.6.2.2	The constraint of the lexical structure on the extended aspectual structure	122
3.7	Summary	126
Chapter 4 An Aspectual-Causal Event Structure Account of English Resultative Constructions		131
4.1	Introduction	131
4.2	Verb types and causal relations.....	132
4.2.1	Physical action verbs: <i>scrubbing</i> -verbs and <i>breaking</i> -verbs.....	133
4.2.2	Motion verbs: <i>running</i> -verbs and <i>entering</i> -verbs.....	135
4.2.3	Behavioral verbs	137

4.2.4	Mental verbs	139
4.2.5	Inductive verbs: <i>persuading</i> -verbs and <i>urging</i> -verbs	140
4.2.6	Special cases	142
4.2.6.1	<i>Following</i> -verbs	142
4.2.6.2	Creation/consumption verbs	143
4.2.6.3	<i>Singing</i> -verbs	146
4.2.6.4	<i>Creaking</i> -verbs	148
4.2.7	Interim summary	149
4.3	The extendedness and right-boundedness of adjectives and prepositions	151
4.3.1	Adjectives	152
4.3.1.1	Non-gradable adjectives	152
4.3.1.2	Maximal endpoint closed-scale gradable adjectives	153
4.3.1.3	Minimum endpoint closed-scale gradable adjectives ..	154
4.3.1.4	Open-scale adjectives	155
4.3.2	Prepositions	156
4.3.2.1	Source Prepositions	157
4.3.2.2	Goal Prepositions	158
4.3.2.3	Route Prepositions	158
4.3.2.4	Comparative Prepositions	159
4.3.2.5	Constant Prepositions	159
4.3.2.6	Geometric Prepositions	160
4.3.2.7	Periodic Prepositions	160
4.4	Analyzing nuclear constructions	161
4.4.1	Physical action verbs in nuclear constructions	162
4.4.2	Motion verbs in nuclear constructions	164
4.4.3	Behavioral verbs in nuclear constructions	165
4.4.4	Mental action verbs in nuclear constructions	167

4.4.5	Inducive action verbs in nuclear constructions	168
4.4.6	Special cases	170
4.4.6.1	<i>Following</i> -verbs in nuclear constructions.....	170
4.4.6.2	<i>Creation/consumption</i> verbs in nuclear constructions ..	172
4.4.6.3	<i>Singing</i> -verbs in nuclear constructions	174
4.4.6.4	<i>Creaking</i> -verbs in nuclear constructions	176
4.5	Analyzing English resultative constructions	178
4.5.1	Physical action verbs in English resultative constructions..	178
4.5.1.1	<i>Scrubbing</i> -verbs.....	178
4.5.1.2	<i>Breaking</i> -verbs.....	182
4.5.2	Motion verbs in English resultative constructions	184
4.5.2.1	<i>Running</i> -verbs.....	184
4.5.2.2	<i>Entering</i> -verbs	188
4.5.2	Behavioral verbs in English resultative constructions.....	189
4.5.4	Mental verbs in English resultative constructions.....	193
4.5.5	Inducive verbs in English resultative constructions	195
4.5.5.1	<i>Urging</i> -verbs.....	195
4.5.5.2	<i>Persuading</i> -verbs.....	197
4.5.6	Special cases	198
4.5.6.1	<i>Following</i> -verbs in English resultative constructions..	199
4.5.6.2	<i>Creation/consumption</i> verbs in English resultative constructions.....	202
4.5.6.3	<i>Singing</i> -verbs in English resultative constructions	204
4.5.6.4	<i>Creaking</i> -verbs in English resultative constructions ...	209
4.6	Summary	212
Chapter 5 Conclusions and Discussions.....		217
5.1	Main findings	217

5.2	Implications.....	224
5.2.1	The invalidity of Aspectual Interface Hypothesis	225
5.2.2	The invalidity of the manner / result complementary distribution.....	226
5.2.3	Telicity and English resultative constructions.....	227
5.2.4	Homomorphism and English resultative constructions.....	228
5.3	Suggestions for future research	230
References		233

Chapter 1 Introduction

This is a study of English resultative constructions from the perspective of Syntax-Semantics Interface. It is aimed at providing an account of how grammatical English resultative constructions are generated in light of aspectual features and causal relations encoded in the verb.

In this chapter, first of all, based on the introduction to English resultative constructions four research questions are proposed; secondly, the background of the study will be introduced: three major approaches to English resultative constructions and their achievements and limitations will be briefly mentioned; thirdly, a sketch of the aspectual-causal event structure will be presented; finally, the organization of this dissertation will be specified.

1.1 English resultative constructions and research questions

English resultative constructions constitute a special case at “the Syntax-Semantics Interface” (Carter, 1976; Fillmore, 1970; Rosen, 1984; Wasow, 1985; Zaenen 1988). They usually have a syntactic form of NP₁ VP (NP₂) AP/PP^① with the semantics that NP₁ does

① NP= noun phrase, VP=verb phrase, AP=adjectival phrase, PP= prepositional phrase

something to cause a change in NP₂, or something happened to NP₁ as a result it experiences changes. Compared with the syntactic structure of nuclear constructions which consists subject and direct object or only subject, the syntactic structure of English resultative constructions has a third component: the resultative phrase, or the secondary predicate. For example:

- (1) a. Herman hammered the metal *flat*.
- b. The critics laughed the play *off the stage*.
- c. We yelled ourselves *hoarse*.
- d. The river froze *solid*.
- e. Bill followed the road *into the forest*.

(Goldberg & Jackendoff, 2004)

English resultative constructions can be easily confused with depictive constructions which also take the form of NP₁ VP (NP₂) AP. For example:

- (2) a. Noa ate the meat *raw*.
- b. Joshua broke the glass *new*.
- c. Nadav cooked the vegetables *fresh*.
- d. Rebecca sold the book *used*.
- e. Ethan photographed Nadav *happy*.

(Rapoport, 1993)

The terms “depictive” and “resultative” were first used by Halliday (1976) to refer to two contrasting types of attributive clauses. By attributive, Halliday means “a characteristic ascribed to one of the participants in the clause; but it is one that relates specifically to the process in question” (ibid.: 62). In the depictive construction, the AP

characterizes the direct object or the subject at the initiation of the action or process denoted by the verb, while in the resultative construction, the AP characterizes the direct object or subject at the final point of the action or process denoted by the verb. Therefore, (2a) means: “Noa ate the meat, and at the time that she ate it, it was raw”, whereas (1a) means: “Herman hammered the metal, and as a result, the hammering action made the metal become flat”.

In addition to these surface features, English resultative constructions have many other tricky syntactic and semantic characteristics. In the first place, the secondary predicate or the resultative phrase can be predicated either of the direct object, or of the subject (Rappaport & Levin, 2001; Verspoor, 1997; Wechsler, 1997, 2001, 2005). For example:

(3) Resultative phrases predicated of the direct object

a. Willy watered the plants *flat*.

(meaning: Willy watered the plants, and as a result they fell flat.)

b. Bill rolled the ball *down the hill*.

(meaning: Bill rolled the ball, and as a result the ball were rolled down the hill.)

(4) Resultative phrases predicated of the subject

a. The sailors rode the breeze *clear of the rocks*.

(meaning: The sailors rode the breeze and as a result the sailors got clear of the rocks.)

b. Fred tracked the leak *to its source*.

(meaning: Fred tracked the leak, and as a result he got to its source.)

c. John danced mazurkas *across the room*.

(meaning: John danced mazurkas and as a result he got to the other side of the room.)

d. We drove Highway 5 *from SD to SF*.

(meaning: We drove along Highway 5 and as a result our location changed from SD to SF.)

e. Bill followed the road *into the forest*.

(meaning: Bill followed the road and as a result he went into the forest.)

(Goldberg & Jackendoff, 2004)

In the second place, some intransitive verbs can appear transitive in English resultative constructions. For example:

(5) a. Jenn danced herself tired. (Boas, 2002)

b. *Jenn danced herself.^①

(6) a. Pat ran her shoes to shreds. (Rappaport & Levin, 1998)

b. *Pat ran her shoes.

In the third place, some verbs, like the “incremental theme verbs” (Dowty, 1991; Rothstein, 2001b) and surface contact verbs, exhibit a more flexible verbal polysemy or “regular polysemy” (Apresjan, 1973) with English resultative constructions than some other verbs, like the change-of-state verbs. For example:

① An asterisk before a sentence or other forms indicates ungrammaticality; a question-mark indicates dubious grammaticality.