

谢都全 © 著

# 同构视角下动词短语句法研究

An Isomorphic Perspective on Verb Phrase Syntax



上海交通大学出版社  
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

## 1 Larson's (1988) Theory of VP Shells

is important for us to have a look at Larson's theory of VP shells first, since  
s VP shells have been inherited or extended in Chomsky's works and Hale  
shells is configurational approach to thematic relations and event structures.  
config a lot of others. Larson's theory was originally proposed to account  
a lot of the object construction in English. This theory includes two  
e object) There can be more than one VP projection  
i) The predicate, and each VP projection has a head  
predicate

it is important here is the observation that movement can not ski  
of the surface forms, different m  
Hale

当代语言学研究文库

上海市教委科研创新和重点学科项目

# 同构视角下动词短语句法研究

An Isomorphic Perspective on Verb Phrase Syntax

谢都全 著

上海交通大学出版社

## 内 容 提 要

本书提出一个对动词句法结构和论元结构做出解释的语言表征理论,即一个有关动词论元如何在句法和语义结构中得以实现,动词的语义如何从所假定的基本事件语义构成成分中推导出来的理论。书中构建了句法、论元和事件语义结构同构的理论,提取了基本的事件语言构成成分,所有语义共享这些组分,呈现参数化差异。该理论从结果结构、额外论元结构及跨语言的比较方面得到验证。

本书可供高等院校语言学专业的研究生、教师和二语习得研究者阅读参考。

### 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

同构视角下动词短语句法研究:英文/谢都全著.

—上海:上海交通大学出版社,2011

(当代语言学研究文库)

ISBN 978-7-313-07209-2

I. 同... II. 谢... III. 英语—动词—短语  
—句法—研究—英文 IV. H314.3

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2011)第 182847 号

### 同构视角下动词短语句法研究

An Isomorphic Perspective on Verb Phrase Syntax

谢都全 著

上海交通大学出版社出版发行

(上海市番禺路 951 号 邮政编码 200030)

电话:64071208 出版人:韩建民

常熟市文化印刷有限公司 印刷 全国新华书店经销

开本:787mm×960mm 1/16 印张:14.5 字数:270 千字

2011 年 10 月第 1 版 2011 年 10 月第 1 次印刷

印数:1~1530

ISBN 978-7-313-07209-2/H 定价:47.00 元

---

版权所有 侵权必究

告读者:如发现本书有质量问题请与印刷厂质量科联系

联系电话:0512-52219025

## 前言

对动词短语及其论元结构的研究是句法语义界面研究的核心内容。以往对动词论元结构的研究,不论是词汇主义方法还是词汇语义方法都基于某些联系和匹配规则之上。以后有学者提出论元结构的句法方法,该方法认为动词的句法表征决定了该动词论元的事件角色及其语义解读,这种方法比较经济,大大地简化了句法语义界面。本书在句法方法的基础上更进一步,提出了一个对动词句法结构和论元作出解释的同构的语言表征理论,即一个有关动词论元如何在句法结构和语义结构中得以实现或表征,动词的语义如何从假定的基本事件语义构成成分推导出来的理论。具体说来,本书要解决以下几个问题:界定进入语言运算的基本成分的属性;了解这些基本成分组合生成复杂表征结构的方式;找出不同语言在组合这些基本成分时呈现的跨语言的差异及其原因。

本书的理论框架基于这样一种假设,即动词的论元结构表征、事件结构表征和句法结构表征是一致的、同构的。该理论旨在建立一个透明的句法语义界面,使得动词的语义及其论元能很容易地从其所在的句法结构中得到解读。在该理论框架之下,动词的语义由一些基本的事件语义构成成分,包括引导事件的功能性成分或动词化中心语和表示百科知识的无语类的词根合成生成。本书认为所有的语言都共享这些相同的构成成分,遵循相同的句法制约,且会呈现参数化差异。该理论融合了其他很多理论的成分,包括分配形态学、语态理论、词汇句法理论及近来的一些关于论元结构的句法理论等,并得到了英汉语料的印证。

本书提出三个基本的事件引导成分  $V_{DO}$ 、 $V_{GO}$  和  $V_{BE}$  以及两种词根:动作和状态词根,这些成分构成了生成复杂事件的基本成分。两种词根的提出是基于汉语中单音节动词大体上属于动作动词和状态动词这一事实,并在文中给予了论证。汉语的结果复合词表达复杂事件,该结构强有力地支持本书所提出的同构的事件论元结构理论。结果复合结构的论元实现的各种方式、论元的解读,包括各种歧义现象在本书的理论

之下都得到很好的解释。本书用控制理论来解释汉语结果复合词呈现的论元共享现象,该理论的运用使论元结构理论也遵循着诸如最短距离原则等句法制约。这也说明该论元结构和事件结构同构的理论其实也是有关句法结构的理论。

本书还对汉语额外论元现象进行研究,包括非典型双宾句和及物非宾格句。本书认为额外论元的实现由高阶施用成分准允,因为高阶施用成分界定的是论元与事件之间的关系,而汉语非典型双宾句和及物非宾格句中的额外论元正是受动作事件和状态变化事件影响的论元。

最后,本书对英汉两种语言进行了跨语言的比较研究。由于本书假定所有语言都共享相同的论元和事件构成成分,并遵循相同的句法制约,那么为何英汉两种语言在表达事件的语言表征形式和动词的使用行为上会呈现出差异?本书认为不同的语言会利用不同的方式去生成某一事件的表征形式,也因此能区分不同的结构。例如,在表达复杂致使事件时,汉语会表征出一个或两个词根,而英语却只能是一个;在表达起动时,汉语会借助标记“了”,而英语可以利用一些动词后缀对表达起动的动词化中心语进行表征。动词的论元实现呈现的跨语言差异可以看成是构成事件和论元的基本成分,即引导事件的功能性成分和词根相互作用所呈现出来的差异。

总之,本书阐述的论元结构理论既是一种关于事件和论元如何在句中得以表征的理论,又是一种透明的句法语义界面理论。该理论既遵循句法制约,又基于事件结构,从而不同于传统的论元结构,不需太多人为规定,如联系规则的制约,并对更多的现象作出解释。

本书是在笔者博士论文的基础上修改而成的,其主要观点和研究思路对研究句法语义界面提供了一个崭新的事件结构视角。

本书得到上海市教委科研创新项目(编号:12ZS168)和第五期重点学科外国语言学及应用语言学项目(编号:A-3102-06-000)资助。

本书的完成离不开许多人的关心和帮助。首先要感谢的是我的博士生导师周国强教授。他的严谨治学、悉心指导和慈父般关爱使得本书得以完成,他那淡泊名利的泰然使我深受感染。此外,我还得到了很多教授、学者的无私的帮助,其中特别要感谢上海交通大学的卫乃兴教授、俞理明教授、陈永捷教授和陈德明教授,华东理工大学的邵志洪教授,上海

海事大学的王大伟教授,华东师范大学的张春柏教授,上海外国语大学的梅德明教授和束定芳教授,复旦大学的曲卫国教授。华东师范大学的邹为诚教授对本书写作提出了宝贵意见。此外,还要感谢郭鸿杰博士、阚哲华博士、王奇博士、韩庆果博士、姚剑鹏博士、张达球博士、詹宏伟博士、杨小虎博士、常辉博士以及上海交通大学外国语学院众多的师长和朋友给予我的真诚指点和无私帮助。

最后我要感谢我的家人:特别是我的妻子郭应可女士,她的深爱和支持给了我力量;我的父母,他们一直的无私奉献,为我分解忧愁;我的儿子朗朗,他的聪颖可爱和茁壮成长每天都给我带来惊喜。

由于时间和水平有限,书中纰漏在所难免,其中舛误,概由笔者负责。

**谢都全**

2011年9月

# 英汉缩略语对照表

AIH	Aspectual Interface Hypothesis	体界面假设
ASP	aspect	体
CL	classifier	单位词(量词)
comp	complement	补语
DM	Distributed Morphology	分布形态学
DO	direct object	直接宾语
DOC	double object construction	双宾结构
DOR	Direct Object Restriction	直接宾语限制
DP	determiner phrase	限定词短语
D-structure	deep structure	深层结构
ECM	Exceptional Case Marking	额外格标记
GB theory	Government and Binding theory	管约论
H	head	核心
HAppl	high applicative	高阶施用
IO	indirect object	间接宾语
LAppl	low applicative	低阶施用
LRS	Lexical Relational Structure	词汇关系结构
l-syntax	lexical-syntax	词汇句法
MDP	Minimal Distance Principle	最小距离原则
NCTV	non-core transitive verb	非核心及物动词
NP	noun phrase	名词短语
PP	Projection Principle	投射原则
RVC	resultative verb compound	结果复合动词
S	sentence	句子
spec	specifier	指示语
UAH	Universal Alignment Hypothesis	普遍联系假设
UG	universal grammar	普遍语法
UTAH	Uniformity of Theta Assign Hypothesis	题元指派一致假设
V	verb	动词
$\theta$ -Criterion	theta-criterion	题元准则
$\theta$ -role	theta role	题元角色

# Contents

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b>	1
1.1 General Objective	1
1.2 Structure of the Book	2
1.3 Argument Structure: An Overview	4
1.4 Summary	42
<b>Chapter 2 An Isomorphic Model of Argument Structure</b>	43
2.1 Introduction	43
2.2 Theoretical Framework	44
2.3 Summary	68
<b>Chapter 3 The Event Composition in Mandarin Chinese</b>	69
3.1 Prima Facie Evidence	69
3.2 Previous Studies on Mandarin Event Types	71
3.3 Our Claim	72
3.4 Summary	103
<b>Chapter 4 Resultative Verb Compounds in Mandarin Chinese</b>	104
4.1 Introduction	104
4.2 Why Study Resultative Construction?	104
4.3 Towards a Definition of RVCs	106
4.4 Classification of RVCs	111
4.5 The Host of a Resultative Predicate	118
4.6 Some Approaches to RVCs	120
4.7 The Syntactic Account of RVCs	133
4.8 Control and Ambiguity	147
4.9 Residual Issues: The Status of V1 in RVCs	156



4.10	Summary .....	157
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Extra-argumentality in Mandarin Chinese .....</b>	<b>159</b>
5.1	The Phenomenon of Extra-argumentality .....	159
5.2	Double Object Construction .....	164
5.3	The Transitive Unaccusative .....	180
5.4	Summary .....	186
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Cross-linguistic Variations .....</b>	<b>188</b>
6.1	Introduction .....	188
6.2	A Few Issues .....	189
6.3	Our Account .....	192
6.4	Summary .....	199
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>201</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>204</b>

# Chapter 1 Introduction

## 1.1 General Objective

Argument structure is an interface involving syntax and semantics and plays an important role in modern theories of language. In some very intuitive sense, verbs describe events in the world and verbal arguments name individuals that stand in some relevant relations to these events. As Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) observe, languages must have the means to depict or denote the participants involved in these events and their relationships.

Despite a lack of agreement on the details of representation, most theories of lexical semantics try to capture this basic intuition in some way. Since the lexical semantic representations are all different from the *syntactic* structures in which verbal arguments appear and the lexical entries of verbs are semantically complex in a way that differs from the complexity encountered at the sentential level, these theories must be accompanied by such theories that state exactly how the predicates and arguments in the lexical semantic representations map onto syntactic positions, i. e., linking theories or rules. In contrast to these theories where lexical complexity is considered to be of a different sort from syntactic complexity, a large body of research has converged on the idea that systematic relations between meaning and syntactic behavior of verbs and arguments are the product of event structure, that is, argument structure is built on the basis of event types or the predicates that verbs express. According to this view, it is not the lexical semantic properties of a verb that determine its syntax. Rather, the syntactic representation determines the event roles and the event interpretation of the sentence (Baker, 1988; Hale and Keyser, 1993; Marantz, 1997; Harley, 1995; Miyagawa, 1998; Borer, 1994, 1998; Travis, 2000; Lin, 2004; Kan, 2006; etc.). To them, lexical semantic representations *are* syntactic representations and, consequently, no mapping problem arises. This eliminates the need for linking rules, which, in any case, are seldom more than

generalizations over observed correspondences between argument positions and their interpretations. This latter approach is often termed as constructional approach.

In line with the latter approach, the present book aims to work out a theory of verbal argument structure that attempts to account for how arguments, core arguments and non-core arguments as well are licensed semantically and syntactically, that is, how arguments are projected into a syntactic structure and how they get the meanings they have, and meanwhile the process by which verb meanings are compositionally derived from some conceptual primitives. The primary goal of it is to understand verbal argument structure in general in terms of syntactically-encoded primitives and in terms of independently-motivated syntactic principles.

To be more specific, the present book must minimally address the following issues:

- (1) a. define the nature of the primitive building blocks that enter into linguistic computation,
- b. characterize the manner in which the basic units combine into complex representations and
- c. identify the ways in which languages may differ with respect to their inventory of possible representations.

(Pylkkänen, 2002: 9)

The first two issues, in Cuervo's (2003) words, are "to provide explicit theories of what the relevant parts are and what mechanisms they combine into structures." This book will meet these requirements in the domain of verbal argument structure, focusing on the question of how arguments of the verb, core as well as non-core or extra arguments get introduced into argument structures.

---

## 1.2 Structure of the Book //

This book, which consists of seven parts, is structured as follows:

Chapter 1 is an overview of the approaches to the study of verbal argument structure, in which lexicalist approach, lexical-semantic or aspectually-based approach and syntactic approach are reviewed. It is pointed out that the syntactic-based approach is more advisable in that it dramatically simplifies the theory of

argument structure, since it eliminates the need for both an independent lexical semantic representation and a linking theory. This also shapes the argument structure theory of the present book.

Chapter 2 lays out the theoretical framework and builds an isomorphic theory of argument structure, in which argument structure, event structure and semantics are compositionally “built-up” from some ontological set of primitives. This theory owes its formation to several recently-developed theories, like *Distributed Morphology*, *Voice Hypothesis*, *Lexical Relational Structure*, theories regarding causation and some semantic rules.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the study of Mandarin event types, which provides basic support for our theory of verbal argument structure. The study of the Mandarin event types reveals that monomorphemic verbs are either activity or stative verbs (with a few exceptions) and they cannot encode accomplishments and achievements. Achievements and accomplishments are complex events and are derived from stative roots in Mandarin Chinese, which provides evidence that event composition is syntactic in nature.

Chapter 4 is an extension of Chapter 3 and examines Mandarin resultative verb compounds (RVCs) in detail. Since resultative constructions involve complex composition of events, they serve as a good test for any theory of argument structure. We give a working definition and define the boundary of RVCs, and demonstrate the complexity in their argument realization patterns. It is shown that our syntactic framework can nicely captures all the necessary requirements, naturally accounting for semantic ambiguities and the ungrammaticality of certain forms. Particularly, control theory is employed to account for the sharing of arguments.

Chapter 5 is an intensive study of extra-argumentality in Mandarin Chinese, with the focus on the non-canonical double object constructions (DOC) and transitive unaccusative constructions. Extra arguments in these constructions are licensed by a high applicative head, which defines the relation between an individual and an event. And they are the arguments affected by an activity event and change of state event respectively.

Chapter 6 focuses on cross-linguistic differences between Mandarin Chinese and English. It is shown that different languages employ different devices to generate legitimate structures and distinguish between different structures.

Though incomplete, it will provide us with a new perspective to view the cross-linguistic variations.

Chapter 7 concludes this book. Main ideas of this book are summarized, and some remaining problems are mentioned.

## 1.3 Argument Structure: An Overview

Before we embark on the details of our program, it is conventionally necessary to have a fair and thorough review of previous approaches towards argument structure in the literature. “The term ‘argument structure’ refers to the specification of and relation between a word’s semantic and syntactic arguments. Differentiating the three verbs *devour*, *eat*, and *swallow* is in part a matter of assigning them different argument structures” (Jackendoff, 2002:134). The participants involved in states of affairs are called the semantic arguments. The roles that the participants play in the states of affairs are often called the participants’ thematic roles or theta roles ( $\theta$ -role, for short).

### 1.3.1 Lexicalist Approach

Ever since Chomsky (1965, 1970), it has been standard to postulate a component called the lexicon. In most current generative syntactic theories, the lexical entries include certain information which is projected into the syntax usually as an irreducible and syntactically atomic unit. It is generally accepted that the semantic features of the lexical elements determine the information that is encoded in the entry.

It is no doubt that there is a strong correlation between syntactic position of an argument and its semantic properties. There is overwhelming cross-linguistic evidence: the subjects of unergatives and transitives have an agentive role, while subjects of unaccusatives as well as objects of transitives behave as patient or theme. This distinction clearly correlates with the distinction between external and internal argument positions in syntax whereby the external arguments are agents and the internal arguments are themes. The debate surrounding argument realization centers on the method in which this mapping or correlation of meaning and structure actually takes place.

In lexicalist approaches to verb or predicate formation, the correlation

between the lexical representation of verbal entries and the syntactic structure is obtained by a linking mechanism. Verbs are compositionally formed in the lexicon and then the arguments are linked or projected to specific positions within syntax. Thus the lexical entries are fully annotated containing information needed for mapping or projection of the arguments into syntactic structure. Argument structure is a mediator between the lexical information and the clausal realization of the verb's arguments. Although the various approaches differ as to the type and amount of information contained in a lexical entry, they share a certain notion of argument structure which predetermines the projection of verb and its arguments conditioned by the underlying semantic factors. This type of information that is often contained in the lexical entry of the verb includes acidity or the number and the type of arguments a verb projects.

### 1.3.1.1 Subcategorization Frames and Thematic Roles

With the information included in the lexical item, the participants implied by the word and the relationship among them play a central role. Such participants are termed arguments of the word, and such information is considered to be part of its lexical entry. Chomsky (1965) proposes that each predicate contains as part of its lexical entry the number of arguments that it requires or selects, characterized according to their syntactic category. Such information forms the subcategorization frame of the predicate. Some examples are given here:

(1) a. run, V: NP [ ]

b. kiss, V: NP [ ] NP

The verb *run* implies the existence of one participant (the subject) and the verb *kiss* the participation of two elements (the one who performs the action and the one who undergoes it—even in the case when the two arguments refer to the same person, as in the reflexive *John kissed himself*).

Generative grammar traditionally assumes the realization of a verb's arguments to be determined by information registered in a structured lexical entry for that verb. In early versions of generative grammar, the syntactic expression of a verb's arguments is directly encoded in its lexical entry in the form of a subcategorization frame. However, there is not general consensus on the grain size of the frame, that is, on what elements, syntactic and semantic elements as well should be represented and how they are represented in the frame. For instance,

Williams (1980) holds the subject is represented in the frame by being given an underlying notation, while others (Marantz 1982, Kratzer 1988) eliminate subject from the subcategorization frame of the predicate altogether; whether the single argument of intransitive verbs should be located inside or outside the subcategorization frame in order to differentiate the unaccusatives and unergatives (Burzio 1981; Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 1995) has not been agreed upon; some authors propose to represent arguments with variables, instead of syntactic categories, which are ordered among each other in a structural way (e. g., Zubizarreta, 1987) or get their interpretation in relation to some functional categories in the syntax (Borer, 1996; Ritter and Rosen, 1998); some claim that some meaning specifications should be represented in the frame, not merely the syntactic category imposed on the arguments by the predicate. Bresnan (1970) argues convincingly that categorical information alone is not enough to correctly predict the distribution of arguments. For example, based on grammatical sentences such as (2a) and the like, the verb *reside* can be assigned to the subcategorization frame in (2b).

(2) a. The president resides in the White House.

b. *reside*, V; NP [\_\_ PP]

However, clearly not any preposition can be candidate to head the PP arguments of the verb. In fact only prepositions that express a location, but not path or coincidence can successfully head such complement:

(3) The president resides in /near /by / \* across / \* of/ \* with the White House.

Since arguments selection seems to be sensitive to semantic features of the arguments, some suggest that semantic information of arguments should also be included in the lexical entry of the predicate (Grimshaw, 1979; and Jackendoff 1983, 1990; among others). This will of course give rise to the problems of deciding which semantic features to be included in the frames. Cases like *reside* above justify features like LOCATION or PATH to be likely candidates, configuring the entry in (4), from Emonds (2000):

(4) *reside*, V + \_\_ [SPACE, PLACE]

Including semantic notions associated with the arguments of the predicate can also help explain some apparent idiosyncrasies of lexical items with respect to whether or not they allow for certain phenomena. For example, Anderson (1998)

argues that only objects that are somehow affected by the event denoted by the verb allow for such verb to appear in English middle construction. Hence, *cut* in (5a) can appear as a middle in (5b), while *watch* in (6a) cannot in (6b), because only in the former case the object is affected by the action performed by the subject.

- (5) a. The baker cuts the bread every morning.
- b. Fresh bread cuts easily.
- (6) a. I watch a movie every Sunday.
- b. Foreign movies watch easily.

Indicating such semantic features between arguments with respect to the meaning expressed by the predicate is further elaborated in Gruber's (1965) thematic grid or thematic (theta-) roles, Case Frame/Grammar (Fillmore, 1968), Jackendoff (1972), Burzio (1986), Chomsky (1981). They formulate the constraints on how NPs with different thematic roles (theta-roles or  $\theta$ -roles) can be associated with a verb. Fillmore's theory of thematic relations (Fillmore, 1968) has been the foundation of the  $\theta$ -Theory in the mainstream GB literature since Chomsky (1981). In his theory, the propositional component of a sentence can be represented as an array consisting of the verb and a number of noun phrases specifically marked with thematic roles, which include such event-based roles as Agentive, Instrumental, Dative, Locative/Goal, Objective/Patient, and Comitative (Fillmore, 1968) and which are different from the now familiar names widely used in the generative literature. For example, instead of Agentive, the now widely used term is Agent. The lexical entry of each predicate (verb) specifies the constellation of thematic roles it takes, i. e., its case frame. For instance, *kick* takes an agent and a patient, while *frighten* takes an experiencer and a stimulus. The thematic structure of both the sentences *John killed Bill* and *Bill was killed by John* is something like *kill* <John, Bill> or *kill* V <Agent, Patient>. In this tradition, thematic roles are primitives, which occupy distinct positions in the deep/D-structure of a sentence.

As for what argument is realized as the subject of a sentence, Fillmore (1968) has a hierarchy stipulation:

(7) Subjectivization Hierarchy

If there is an [Agentive], it becomes the subject; otherwise, if there is an [Instrumental], it becomes the subject; otherwise, the subject is the [Objective].



Implicit in this hierarchy is a biuniqueness relation, stated as follows:

(8) Thematic Biuniqueness:

- a. Uniqueness of thematic roles: Each argument associates with a unique thematic role licensed by the predicate.
- b. Uniqueness of arguments: Each thematic role licensed by the predicate associates with a unique argument.

The fundamental assumption of most lexicalist positions is that many aspects of the syntactic structure of a sentence (and in particular how many arguments a verbal predicate has and where they are realized) are directly dependent on the lexical properties of the verbal entry. The lexical meaning of a verb, computed straight from the lexical entry, determines its syntactic behavior via linking rules in terms of thematic roles.

The projection of argument position and syntactic structure is considered by general principles of grammar: the Projection Principle (PP), the Theta Criterion, Universal Alignment Hypothesis (UAH) and the Uniformity of Theta Assign Hypothesis (UTAH).

The PP (Chomsky, 1981) states that lexical information is preserved at all levels of representation.

(9) Universal Theta-Assignment Hypothesis

Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure.

Some authors seriously doubt its validity and argue for its abandonment altogether. Rosen (1984) presents two powerful arguments against UTAH: cross-linguistic variability and intra linguistic variability. As UTAH governs linking of thematic and syntactic positions and predicts that thematically equivalent predicates should be mapped to structurally identical configurations cross-linguistically, however, Rosen shows that some predicates, such as *die*, act like an unaccusatives verb in Italian, but an unergative verb in Choctaw. Since UTAH applies at deep structure and unaccusatives and unergative verbs project different positions for their only argument in deep structure, these data are problematic. More troublesome still is the case in which verbs that fall into the same semantic class within a language, such as Italian *russar*, (“snore”), and *arrossire*, (“blush”), both verbs of bodily process (Levin, 1993), but differ in their projection of arguments (the first one being unergative and the second one