

教育部人文社会科学重点研究基地重大项目(批准号: 12JJD740006)基金 资助
广东外语外贸大学学术著作出版基金

L2 Acquisition of English Reflexives and Objects

英语反身代词和宾语代词的 二语习得研究

姜 琳 著



科学出版社

教育部人文社会科学重点研究基地重大项目(批准号: 12JJD740006)基金 资助
广东外语外贸大学学术著作出版基金

L2 Acquisition of English Reflexives and Objects

英语反身代词和宾语代词的 二语习得研究

姜 琳 著

科 学 出 版 社

北 京

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

英语反身代词和宾语代词的二语习得研究 = L2 Acquisition of English Reflexives and Objects: 英文 / 姜琳著. —北京: 科学出版社, 2012.5

ISBN 978-7-03-034062-7

I. ①英… II. ①姜… III. ①英语-代词-研究 IV. ①H314.2

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2012)第 072478 号

责任编辑: 阎 莉 / 责任校对: 赵桂芬

责任印制: 赵德静 / 封面设计: 无极书装

联系电话: 010-6403 0529 电子邮箱: yanli@mail.sciencep.com

科学出版社出版

北京东黄城根北街 16 号

邮政编码: 100717

<http://www.sciencep.com>

双青印刷厂印刷

科学出版社编务公司排版制作

科学出版社发行 各地新华书店经销

*

2012 年 5 月第 一 版 开本: A5 (890×1240)

2012 年 5 月第一次印刷 印张: 6 1/2

字数: 310 000

定价: 42.00 元

(如有印装质量问题, 我社负责调换)

Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed in their different ways to this book. My deepest gratitude goes to Professor Roger Hawkins. Without his invaluable guidance, thoughtful and detailed comments and suggestions, and warm encouragement, this work would not have been completed. I had the good fortune to meet such a teacher, who is an expert on second language research, and most importantly, who is so kind to his students.

I have also benefited from the Second Language Acquisition Discussion Group conducted by Prof. Roger Hawkins. At the group meeting I presented parts of my work. The valuable feedback from my colleagues is deeply appreciated. Parts of my work were published in *Second Language Research* (25, 4). Many thanks are due to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback.

Much of this research on which the book is based was carried out during my doctoral studies at the University of Essex. Many thanks go to Dai Zhengqin for helping me with the data collection, as well as the students at the Zhejiang University in China for taking part in the test. Thanks are also due to the external examiner Nigel Duffield and the internal examiner Martin Atkinson for their valuable and useful comments on my research.

I would like to thank my parents Jiang Keming and Zhang Weiping who have been supporting me financially and emotionally. For their generous love, my gratitude cannot be expressed within lines of words. I also thank Zhang Ting for her friendship. One person I would like to thank in particular is my husband, Xu Jianhui, who has been with me during my study at the University of Essex and

supporting me in various aspects of my life.

Finally, I offer my sincere thanks to Professor Wang Chuming, by whom I have been tremendously enlightened at the Second Language Acquisition Seminars and Ms. Yan Li for her patience, energy, and dedication during the preparation of the manuscript. Thanks also go to Guandong University of Foreign Studies and the Faculty of English Language and Culture for their financial assistance in publishing the book.

Needless to say, all mistakes, shortcomings or other failings of this book are, of course, my own.

前 言

本书介绍了英语代词的二语习得研究,着重比较了中国英语学习者在反身代词以及宾语代词两个领域的习得情况。

根据 Chomsky (1981) 的约束第一原则 (Binding Principle A), 反身代词必须在其管辖语域内受约束。虽然约束第一原则为各种语言所遵守, 但是管辖语域因语言而异, 即不同的语言设定不同的管辖语域参数。英语反身代词, 如 himself/herself, 受局部约束, 即先行语和反身代词处在同一个从句中, 而且主语和宾语都可以做它的先行语。例如, Julie_k thought that [June_i talked to Mary_i about herself_{i/j/k}]. 汉语反身代词“自己”可以接受长距离约束, 即先行语和反身代词可以处在不同的从句中, 但是, 它的先行语一定是主语。例如, 张三_k 告诉李四_j [王五_i 害了自己_{i/j/k}]. 对于中国的英语学习者来说, 如果把汉语反身代词的长距离约束效应迁移到英语中, 那么将对英语反身代词局部约束性的习得产生持久的负面影响。例如, 中国学生可能会接触到下面这样的英语句子:

- (a) Mary talked about herself.
- (b) Tom wants Mary to paint herself.
- (c) Tom believed that Mary was painting herself.

例句 (a)–(c) 中的 Mary 可以作 herself 的先行语。但是, 英语输入中没有任何正面证据可以告诉他们, 在下列英语句子中 Mary 不能作 herself 的先行语。除非中国学生早已知道英语反身代词受局部约束, 否则完全可能会判断象 (d)–(f) 这样的英语句子是可以接受的。

- (d) * Mary liked John's pictures of herself.
- (e) * Mary wanted Tom to like herself.
- (f) * Mary believed that herself was ill.

在汉语中, 宾语可以省略。Wang et al. (1992) 对一组汉语母语者的

日常对话的调查显示,空宾语占了宾语总数的 40%。然而,英语不允许空宾语,其宾语是有形的。试比较 (g) 和 (h):

(g) A: 谁看见过张三 i?

B: 李四说王五看见过 e_i 。

(h) A: Who saw Zhangsan_i?

*B: Lisi said that Wangwu saw e_i .

如果中国英语学习者把汉语的空宾语特征迁移到英语中,同样会对英语学习产生持久的负面影响。具体表现在,他们不会听到 *Mary's bike has been stolen. *The police found e_i yesterday.* 这样的英语句子,原因是,英语母语者在这样的句子中使用了代词 *it*。因此,中国英语学习者所接触到的英语句子并不存在空宾语现象。然而,由于汉语空宾语特征的影响,这样的正面证据并不能使他们真正领会英语不允许省略宾语。他们还是会认为,英语中的宾语如汉语中的一样,可以是有形的,也可以被省略,只是暂时还没有接触到省略了宾语的英语语句而已。此外,一些误导性的语言证据,如英语动词的不及物用法 (*He didn't eat today*),可能会进一步坚定他们之前的错误结论:英语允许空宾语的存在。

综上所述,对于中国英语学习者来说,英语反身代词的局部约束性和宾语代词的有形性既不存在于他们的母语中,又不能完全通过英语输入而获取;而且,这两种英语知识在教材和课堂教学中也从未被提及。那么他们是怎样习得这些英语特性的呢?对这两种英语特性的掌握又是否存在差别呢?本书通过系列实验,探讨和比较了中国学生对这两种英语特性的习得。事实上,学者们通常把反身代词和空宾语现象分开研究,但二者关系密切。反身代词受论元位置的主语(或宾语)约束,而空宾语受非论元位置的空话题约束。换言之,二者之间是论元约束和非论元约束的对比关系。因此,我们的研究问题是:当目的语和母语在论元约束和非论元约束领域都存在差异时,二语学习者能否分别建立起目的语在这两个领域的约束特性。

62 名在英国攻读硕士学位的中国留学生组成了实验组,另有 16 名英国当地学生作为对照组参加了实验。中国留学生的年龄在 21-30 岁之

间。他们在实验前都参加了牛津大学的英语水平等级考试。考试满分是60分,分数在48-60之间的相当于高级水平,这些学生的成绩都达到了高级水平。测试方法是让被试做句子理解判断。每一道测试题都包含一段汉语故事和三个关于故事内容的英语评论。我们要求被试先阅读每道题中的故事,然后分别判断三个英语评论的内容是否符合故事内容(符合选择YES,反之选择NO)。我们用汉语来陈述故事,而用英语来做评论有以下两个原因:(1)用汉语来陈述故事可以确保中国学生清晰而且毫无疑问地理解故事内容,从而避免了因对故事内容理解不准确而导致判断错误的可能性;(2)用汉语陈述故事,用英语作评论,可以消除任何可能把故事的表面语法形式作为判断评论依据的企图。在每道题的三个英语评论中,其中一个会包含反身代词 himself 或 herself,其目的是为了考察被试对反身代词约束性的掌握。另一个评论会包含一个空宾语,其目的是为了检测被试是否掌握了英语不允许省略宾语的这一特征;而剩下的一个评论是用来转移被试注意力的。每个测试题中的三个评论都被任意排列。整个测试包含33个故事片段,其中30个与测试主题(反身代词和空宾语)有关。测试前,被试接受了有关测试形式的训练,他们已经知道这个测试要求他们做什么。在测试中,如果遇到生词,允许询问词义。测试不计时,每个人可以按照自己的速度作答。据统计,实验组的完成时间在22-38分钟之间,对照组在18-30分钟之间。

实验结果表明,被试对英语反身代词局部约束性的掌握远好于对宾语代词有形性的掌握。汉语和英语在这两个领域都存在差异,为什么他们可以很好地掌握前者,而很难掌握后者呢?针对这种不对称现象,本书将从“基于普遍语法的语言习得理论”(UG-based Approach)和“基于使用的语言习得理论”(Usage-based Approach)两个角度对实验结果进行全面分析,讨论三种可能的原因(详见姜琳2007)。

正迁移假设

汉语的复合反身代词,如“他/她自己”,被认为与英语反身代词有着相同的局部约束性。因此,有研究(Lakshmanan and Teranishi 1994; Yuan 1994)认为中国英语学习者之所以能够成功地习得英语反身代词的局部约束性,是因为他们的母语中同样存在着具有局部约束性的反身代

词, 他们所要做的仅仅是将这类反身代词迁移到英语学习中就可以了。Yip 和 Tang (1998) 称这种观点为“正迁移假设”(Positive Transfer Hypothesis)。尽管这一假设似乎能很好地解释本次实验中的不对称现象, 然而, 通过对以下三个方面的讨论, 我们发现此假设很难成立。

第一, 汉语复合反身代词对其先行语的“人称/数”特征有着严格的要求。以“他自己”为例, 其先行语被限制为[第三人称、单数、男性], 但是“自己”的先行语可以是任何人称、数量、性别。因此, “自己”的用法非常灵活且使用频率较高, 它常常可以代替句子中的复合反身代词, 而使句子听起来同样自然贴切。Ying (1999) 发现, 尽管日语也存在着复合反身代词, 如 *kare-zisin* (他自己), 并且与英语反身代词有着相同的局部约束特性, 然而, 使用频率较高的长距离简单反身代词 *zibun* (自己) 却影响了日语母语者对英语反身代词的理解。因此我们认为, 使用频率较低的复合反身代词不大会影响中国学生对英语反身代词的理解。

第二, 关于汉语复合反身代词是否与英语反身代词有着相同的局部约束性的问题, 迄今为止还存在很大的争议。有学者认为, “代词+自己”也具有代词特征, 如“王先生_i以为[张小姐爱上了他自己_i]”中“他自己”相当于代词“他”, 可允许长距离约束。

第三, 如果中国学生把汉语复合反身代词的局部约束性迁移到英语中, 那么他们应该完全反对英语反身代词受长距离约束。然而, 本次实验的结果显示, 尽管他们普遍反对英语反身代词受长距离约束, 但还是接受了相当比例的长距离先行语。这种现象同“正迁移假设”是矛盾的。

综合以上三方面的讨论, 我们认为, “正迁移假设”很难成立, 因而不能解释本次实验出现的不对称现象。

二语学习策略之最短距离原则

有学者认为, 二语学习者在习取英语反身代词的过程中会采用一些学习策略, 如最短距离原则 (Minimal Distance Principle) (Chomsky 1969)。根据这一原则, 他们将会选择离反身代词最近的名词作为其先行语。这样一来, 他们似乎掌握了英语反身代词的局部约束性。然而, 从本次实验中中国学生接受了相当比例的长距离先行语的现象来看, 他们

不大可能采用了这种学习策略。因此,这种“学习策略假设”也不能解释本次实验出现的不对称现象。

语法分析

从上文的讨论来看,无论是“正迁移假设”还是“学习策略假设”都不能对本次实验的不对称现象做出合理的解释。接下来笔者提出第三种可能的原因——语法分析(parsing)。二语学习者要对二语输入中的每个句子作语法分析,即给每个句子分派一个语法结构(White 2003: 153)。由于受到母语迁移的影响,二语学习者起初是在母语语法的基础上对二语输入进行语法分析的。当语法分析不成功时,即二语学习者的母语语法与所分析句子的语法结构不一致(inconsistency),语法重建(grammar restructuring)就被激活了。据此逻辑,中国学生对英语输入的语法分析是基于汉语语法进行的。汉语反身代词“自己”的长距离约束效应包含了英语反身代词的局部约束效应,因此,中国学生对那些涉及了反身代词与局部主语同指的英语句子的语法分析总是成功的。故而,语法重建也就无法被激活。但是,当他们接触到下面这样的英语句子时,其母语语法与所分析句子的语法结构之间的不一致就会突显出来。

(i) John talked to Amy_i about herself_i.

例句(i)表明,英语反身代词可以受宾语约束。但是,汉语反身代词“自己”在先行语的选择上具有主语倾向性。一旦注意到这点不一致,中国学生对英语反身代词的重新理解就被激活。随后,在以下三种触发依据(triggering evidence)的帮助下,他们最终习得了英语反身代词的局部约束性。

第一种触发依据是英语反身代词的结构形式。英语反身代词的结构是:(属格/宾格)代词+self. *her own self*、*self-help*、*self-centered*、*self-image*等短语的存在表明 self 在英语中是一个独立的语素。因此,仅从英语反身代词的结构看,其复合形式就一目了然。根据普遍语法中的相对化主语理论(the Relativized SUBJECT Approach),一旦学习者掌握了英语反身代词的复合形式,他们就会自动设定其管辖语域由本局部 XP 决定,从而只接受局部约束。

第二种触发依据是英语反身代词与宾语同指的行为。通过对反身代词约束行为的研究,语言学家们得出了以下结论:1)接受长距离约束的反身代词只能与主语同指;2)可以与宾语同指的反身代词只能受局部约束。通过对英语输入中正面依据的观察(如 John talked to Amy_i about herself_i),中国学生就会发现,英语反身代词可以和宾语同指。在普遍语法的引导下,反身代词与宾语同指的行为会帮助他们认识到英语反身代词只能受局部约束。

第三种触发依据是英语动词的过去时形态。英语行为动词、系动词、助动词的过去式形态会帮助中国学生认识到,英语 Tense 在形态上是有形的(morphologically overt)。有形的 Tense 阻断了英语反身代词在 LF 上的移位,从而阻断了长距离约束。

综上所述,英语输入中的触发依据可以帮助中国学生习得英语反身代词的局部约束性。但是,在对英语有形宾语的习得上,情况却大不相同。汉语在话题省略参数上设定了正值,允许有形宾语,也同样允许空宾语;而英语则选取了这个参数的负值,只允许有形宾语。因此,在这一点上,汉语比英语更具有包容性(inclusive)。这样一来,凡是对涉及此方面的英语输入,中国学生都能成功地进行语法分析。成功的语法分析无法激活话题省略参数值的重新设定,结果就导致中国学生很难认识到英语不允许空宾语的存在。这种结果是不是“僵化现象”(Han and Odlin 2005)还有待进一步验证。我们期待未来的研究可以考察英语水平更高的中国学习者。

Abstract

This book examines second language acquisition (SLA) of English by Chinese speakers in the domain of “pronominality”, a term that will be used here to cover reflexive binding and also the (im) possibility of null objects.

English and Chinese differ in well-defined ways on reflexive binding: English reflexives *himself/herself* can only take local antecedents, whereas the Chinese reflexive *ziji* can have long-distance (LD) antecedents as well as a local one. Studies investigating the acquisition of English reflexives by speakers of Chinese-type languages address the question of whether or not second language (L2) learners whose native language exhibits LD binding are able to acquire the local binding characteristics of English reflexives; that is, will the L2 learners disallow LD binding in their interlanguage grammars (ILGs)? English input may provide ample evidence showing that local binding is possible, but this by no means suggests that LD binding is impossible in English. For example, a Chinese speaker may encounter English sentences like:

- (a) May talked about herself.
- (b) Tom wants Mary to paint herself.
- (c) Tom believed that Mary was painting herself.

Where *Mary* can be an antecedent for *herself*, but there is nothing to tell that Chinese speaker that in sentences like the following *Mary* cannot be an antecedent for *herself*:

- (d) *Mary liked John's picture of herself.
- (e) *Mary wanted Tom to like herself.

(f)* Mary believed that herself was ill.

Cases like (d) and (f) could only be determined as impossible if a learner already knows that English reflexives can only be locally bound. Furthermore, it is quite rare that learners are explicitly told or taught about the locality constraints on the binding of English reflexives. Therefore, the acquisition of English reflexives by speakers of languages that instantiate LD binding (e.g. Chinese) would be a possible case for investigating to what extent Universal Grammar (UG), the first language (L1) and the ability to reset parameters are involved in its acquisition.

The other area that also potentially has the characteristics of L1-L2 difference and underdetermination of knowledge by L2 input is the null-object phenomenon. Chinese freely allows null objects, whereas English does not. Furthermore, the absence of null objects in English is underdetermined by input for Chinese learners in the following sense. A Chinese learner will not hear a native speaker of English using null objects in cases like *Mary's bike_i has been stolen*. **The police found e_i yesterday*. A native speaker of English uses the pronoun *it* in cases like this. However, what this kind of fact triggers and demonstrates to Chinese learners may be merely that in English objects can be overt; they are possible just like overt objects in their L1, and this does not imply that null objects could not exist in English. In addition, English does allow indefinite null objects with certain verbs as shown in *He didn't eat today*. Although these null objects are not variables like those in Chinese but have arbitrary reference. Hence, the presence of this type of sentences in the input might encourage a Chinese learner to assume that English allows null objects more generally.

As noted above, both of these linguistic properties are likely to cause a poverty of stimulus for Chinese learners of English. No previous study has considered both knowledge of reflexive binding and knowledge of the (im)possibility of null objects in the same popula-

tion of advanced L2 learners of English. Previous studies of reflexive binding have typically involved L2 speakers with lower intermediate or intermediate proficiency. Although there have been studies of null objects in advanced speakers, these have not simultaneously addressed reflexive binding. This book aims to compare Chinese learners' interpretation of binding of English reflexives and their knowledge of the ungrammaticality of null objects in English. The research question that will be asked is: whether the grammar of Chinese advanced learners of English might converge on the grammar of native speakers, being identical in both respects, or diverge to a greater or lesser extent. This question is closely linked to the issues of the extent to which L1 influences L2 development, and whether UG is available (and, if so, to what extent) in SLA.

A story-based truth-value judgment task was administered to 62 advanced-level Chinese-speaking learners of English. It was found that the local binding characteristics of English reflexives were acquired with greater ease than the obligatory status of English objects. This can be accounted for by assuming that the L2 learners have adopted the L1 grammar as the initial ILG. In the case of reflexive binding, L2 input was available to disconfirm the inappropriate L1-based analysis, hence restructuring took place. In the case of null objects, however, the Chinese speakers' current grammar appeared to accommodate the L2 input adequately, hence changes were not motivated.

Lin Jiang

30 November 2011

Abbreviations

A	Argument
A'	Non-argument
ACC	Accusative case
Adj	Adjective
Adv	Adverb
Agr	Agreement
ASP	Aspect marker
C(omp)	Complementizer
CHILDES	child language data exchange system
CL	Classifier
CP	Complementizer Phrase
D	Determiner
DAT	Dative
DEC	Declarative marker
DP	Determiner Phrase
<i>e</i>	Empty category
EPP	Extended Projection Principle
F	Feminine gender
FP	finite phrase
GCP	Governing Category Parameter
I(nfl)	Inflection
ILGs	Interlanguage grammars
IP	Inflection Phrase
L1	First language
L2	Second language
LD	Long distance
LF	Logical Form
N	Noun

Neg	Negation
NOM	Nominative case
NP	Noun phrase
Num	Number
OBJ	Object
PAP	Proper Antecedent Parameter
PAST	Past tense
PF	Phonetic Form
PP	Prepositional phrase
Q	Question
QA	Quantified antecedents
QPT	Quick Placement Test
RA	Referential antecedents
R-expression	Referential expression
SAVO	Subject Adverb Verb Object
SD	Standard deviation
SG	Singular
SLA	Second language acquisition
SOV	Subject Object Verb
Spec	Specifier
SUB	Subject
SUBJ	Subjunctive
SVAO	Subject Verb Adverb Object
SVO	Subject Verb Object
<i>t</i>	Trace
TC	Topic chain
Top	Topic
TP	Tense phrase
UG	Universal Grammar
VP	Verb phrase
V2	Verb-second

Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
前言	iii
Abstract.....	ix
Chapter 1 Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 UG and SLA	4
1.2.1 Principles and Parameters of UG	4
1.2.2 SLA	6
1.2.2.1 The Binding of Reflexives	9
1.2.2.2 The Licensing of Null Objects.....	12
1.2.3 Three Major UG-based SLA Theories.....	14
1.2.3.1 The Full Transfer Full Access Hypothesis	14
1.2.3.2 The Minimal Trees Hypothesis	19
1.2.3.3 The Failed Functional Features Hypothesis	22
1.3 Summary	25
Chapter 2 Cross-Linguistic Variation on the Binding of Reflexives and Licensing of Null Objects	29
2.1 Introduction	29
2.2 Cross-linguistic Variation on the Binding of Reflexives	29
2.2.1 The Parameterized Approach.....	31
2.2.2 The Move-to-Infl Approach	34
2.2.3 The Relativized SUBJECT Approach.....	35
2.2.4 A New Approach to the Cross-linguistic Variation on the Binding of Reflexives	38