

LINGUISTICS | 当代语言学研究文库 |

薛小英◎著

Syntax and Semantics of Chinese Wh-Phrases

汉语疑问词的 句法与语义研究

(英文版)



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



LINGUISTICS | 当代语言学研究文库 |

薛小英◎著

Syntax and Semantics of Chinese Wh-Phrases

汉语疑问词的 句法与语义研究

(英文版)



内 容 提 要

本书首先从阻隔效应、辖域歧义和岛效应三个方面探讨了原位疑问词的逻辑语义特征和句法允准机制,认为原位疑问词本身是算符,在逻辑式隐性移位到辖域位置。然后研究了汉语疑问词的显性移位现象,最后考察了疑问词与量化副词的相互作用情况。

本书的主要创新点如下:1. 首次全面系统地研究了汉语原位疑问词的阻隔效应现象。2. 首次论证了汉语有定名词具有量化性质。3. 首次从预设的角度重新分析了疑问词的岛效应现象。4. 重新审视了疑问词的句法移位现象。5. 系统地研究了“都”对疑问名词的量化及其句法实现问题。

本书属于理论语言学的范畴。主要读者对象为高校教师、研究生以及其他语言学爱好者。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

汉语疑问词的句法与语义研究:英文/薛小英著. —上海:
上海交通大学出版社, 2015
ISBN 978-7-313-12291-9

I. ①汉… II. ①薛… III. ①汉语-疑问(语法)-研究-英文
②汉语-疑问(语法)-语义-研究-英文 IV. ①H146.3

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2014)第 254040 号

汉语疑问词的句法与语义研究(英文版)

Syntax and Semantics of Chinese Wh-Phrases

著 者: 薛小英

出版发行: 上海交通大学出版社

地 址: 上海市番禺路 951 号

邮政编码: 200030

电 话: 021-64071208

出 版 人: 韩建民

印 刷: 凤凰数码印务有限公司

经 销: 全国新华书店

开 本: 880mm×1230mm 1/32

印 张: 8

字 数: 252 千字

版 次: 2015 年 1 月第 1 版

印 次: 2015 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978-7-313-12291-9/H

定 价: 38.00 元

版权所有 侵权必究

告 读 者: 如发现本书有印装质量问题请与印刷厂质量科联系

联系电话: 025-83657309

本书的研究和出版得到教育部人文社会科学研究
青年基金项目“汉语疑问词的句法与语义不对称现象
研究”(11YJC740121)的资助。

本专著的出版得到了中南大学外国语学院省级重点学科外国语言文学的资助。

特此鸣谢！

前言

本书主要探讨与汉语原位疑问词相关的四个问题：允准机制、句法移位、副词与疑问词的关联以及疑问词的非疑问用法。

关于原位疑问词的允准问题，有两种截然不同的观点。第一种观点认为原位疑问词本身是算符，在逻辑式隐性移位到辖域位置；第二种观点认为原位疑问词是变量，由处于辖域位置的疑问算符约束并赋予其疑问性质。我们称前者为“移位说”，后者为“原位说”。“移位说”是由 Huang (1982) 在管约论框架内提出来的，表层结构通过量词提升这一移位操作转化为逻辑式。“原位说”以 Tsai (1994, 1999, 2008) 的一系列研究为代表，得到很多学者的认同。这种观点更符合最简方案的经济原则，因为通过合并形成算符比移位更为经济。基于如下原因，笔者支持“移位说”。

第一，汉语原位疑问词表现出阻隔效应。Wu (1999) 发现如果焦点或量词成分统领原位疑问词，相应的句子不合格，却没有作出相应的解释。此后，这种现象一直没有受到关注。最近，国外语言学界对日语、韩语、德语等语言的研究(参见 Beck, 1996a, b, 2006; Beck & Kim, 1997; Ko, 2005 等)表明，量词或焦点成分阻隔原位疑问词的逻辑式移位。阻隔效应被视为原位疑问词逻辑式移位的最有力的证据。通过对相关理论的对比分析，笔者认为 Wu (1999) 观察到的现象可以用阻隔效应来解释。本书更为全面地研究了相关语言现象，认为汉语疑问词确实表现出阻隔效应。阻隔原位疑问词移位的成分有弱式量词和焦点成分。

第二，原位疑问词与强式量词相互作用会产生辖域歧义。我们首先分析了 May (1985) 和 Aoun & Li (1993) 的辖域原则存在的问题，然后提出了基于逻辑式语链的辖域原则，该原则具有更强的解释力。逻辑式语链通过疑问词和量词的隐性移位产生，因此辖域歧义是疑问词逻辑式移位的证据之一。

第三,笔者从预设的角度重新分析了疑问词的岛效应现象。基于对同一语言现象的不同判断,“移位说”和“原位说”都将岛效应视为各自观点的重要事实依据。Tomioka (2009)认为只有原因特指问句预设的是真值命题而其他特指问句的预设都含有变量。我们对此进行了更为深入的研究,发现原因特指问句在句中没有明确的疑问对象。我们的研究与 Lin (1992)对语料的判断不谋而合,只有原因疑问词“为什么”不能在岛外得到解释。鉴于以上分析,笔者认为岛效应与“移位说”和“原位说”这两种观点都无关。

基于以上证据,笔者认同“移位说”。通过逻辑式移位与句法移位的对比研究后,我们认为二者在移位动机和阻隔效应两方面存在差异。我们进一步分析了“原位说”存在的问题。“原位说”两个重要的事实依据是疑问词移位和疑问助词呈互补分布以及原位疑问词可以用作不定代词。然而, Bruening (2007)的研究表明,疑问助词和疑问词的非疑问用法都与疑问词是否移位无关。因此,“原位说”对语言事实的概括不够全面,结论自然缺乏说服力。

本书还探讨了疑问词的句法移位现象。我们认为,这种移位不同于英语疑问词的移位、日语疑问词的前置以及有定名词的主题化。相关文献的研究和跨语言的证据表明,疑问词是句子的焦点,汉语疑问词经焦点化移位到句首位置。

副词与疑问词的关联情况非常复杂,副词对疑问句的合格与否及语义都会产生影响。笔者研究了“都”对疑问名词的量化及其句法实现问题。汉语传统语法学界注意到一个有趣的现象,位于“都”左侧的疑问词用作全称量词;位于“都”右侧的疑问词依然是疑问用法。国内外学者从多种角度对这种现象进行了研究,然而对于“都”和疑问词之间的关系却一直没有达成共识。经过事实分析和理论论证之后,我们认为与左侧成分关联时,“都”是周遍语,投射为功能语类 DistP;与右侧疑问词关联时,“都”是 IP 的附加语,表“穷尽性”。“原位说”认为位于“都”左侧的疑问词用作全称量词能够证明汉语疑问词是变量,“原位说”这样分析显然无法解释疑问词位于“都”右侧的情况。

疑问词的非疑问用法一直是语法学界的难点。除了表示疑问,

汉语疑问词还可以用作全称量词和存在量词。“都/也”投射为功能语类 DistP,疑问词在推导过程中经过[Spec, DistP]获得逐指解。疑问词处于是非问句、正反问句、祈使句中或受否定词或情态副词成分统领时为存在量词。特指问句、选择问句和是非问句作从句时可以不表示疑问,说明疑问句都有非疑问用法。特指问句、选择问句、是非问句和正反问句的反问、设问和祈使等非疑问用法主要由语用因素决定。

我们的研究为量词的分类提供了新的事实依据。Wu (1999)把汉语量词分为强式量词与弱式量词。笔者发现,弱式量词阻隔原位疑问词的逻辑式移位;强式量词与原位疑问词相互作用会产生辖域歧义。此外,我们借鉴 Daniela(2006)对英语名词的研究论证了汉语有定复数名词属于强式量词。

Preface

This book discusses four issues related to Chinese *wh*-in-situ: its licensing mechanism, its syntactic movement, the non-interrogative use of Chinese *wh*-phrases and the association of adverbs with *wh*-in-situ.

There exist two competing approaches explaining why a *wh*-in-situ can be interpreted in its scope position. One assumes that a *wh*-in-situ is an interrogative operator and moves covertly to its scope position at LF while the other assumes that a *wh*-in-situ is a variable and is bound by an interrogative operator in the scope position. We call the former movement approach and the latter non-movement approach. Movement approach, put forward by Huang (1982), works well in GB, in which the transformational rule QR maps S-Structure and LF. Tsai's series of works (1994, 1999, 2008) are representative of non-movement approach, which is supported by many scholars. This approach incorporates well in the MP since Merger is more economical than Move. This book argues for movement approach based on the following arguments.

The first is concerned with intervention effects. Wu (1999) finds that a sentence in which a focus or a quantifier *c*-commands a *wh*-in-situ is ungrammatical but provides no explanation. Since then, these data have been left unaccounted for. Cross-linguistic data from many languages such as Japanese, Korean and German (Beck, 1996a, b, 2006; Beck & Kim, 1997; Ko, 2005) show that LF-movement of a *wh*-in-situ is blocked by a scope bearing element. Intervention effects are regarded as strong arguments for movement approach. This book argues that Wu's (1999) linguistic

data can be attributed to intervention effects. Then more data have been studied and I conclude that Chinese *wh*-phrases do show intervention effects, interveners being a weak quantifier and a focus.

Second, I explore scope ambiguity between a *wh*-phrase and a strong QP. After pointing out empirical problems with scope principles proposed by May (1985) and Aoun & Li (1993), I put forward the LF-chain based scope principle, which can account for more linguistic data. The LF-chain can not be generated without LF-movement of a *wh*-in-situ, thus scope ambiguity forms another piece of evidence for movement approach.

Third, I offer a novel analysis of island effects from the perspective of presuppositions. Based on different judgments of linguistic data, both movement and non-movement approaches regard island effects as their empirical evidence. Tomioka (2009) holds the opinion that a WHY-question presupposes the truth of a non-WHY-proposition while other *wh*-questions include variables in their presuppositions. I extend this analysis further and find *why* has no definite counterpart in its non-interrogative sentence while other *wh*-phrases have. My analysis coincides with Lin's (1992) observation that only *why* can not be explained out of an island. My explanation is neither for movement approach nor for non-movement approach.

Considering the above evidence, I am for movement approach. In my opinion, LF-movement and syntactic movement differ in driving force and intervention effects. I further analyze problems with non-movement approach which is based on empirical data that *wh*-movement and question particles are in complementary distribution and Chinese *wh*-phrases are used as indefinites in some cases. However, these data are not proper according to Bruening (2007) who says that most languages, *wh*-

movement or *wh*-in-situ, have question particles and that there is no connection between *wh*-in-situ and *wh*-indefinites. Thus, non-movement approach can not hold water since its empirical evidence is not proper.

Syntactic movement of a *wh*-noun is also covered in my study. I provide evidence to show that this movement differs from English *wh*-movement, Japanese *wh*-scrambling and topicalization and then argue that a *wh*-noun is a focus in the sentence and this movement is an instance of focalization.

The association of adverbs with *wh*-in-situ is very complex since adverbs can affect the grammaticality or semantics of *wh*-interrogatives. This book investigates *dou* “all”-quantification of a *wh*-noun and its syntactic realization. It has been noted by Chinese grammarians that a *wh*-noun to the left of *dou* “all” is interpreted as a universal quantifier while that to the right of *dou* “all” is interrogative. Although there is an extensive literature dealing with this issue, there has been no consensus as to the semantic function of *dou* “all” and the quantificational status of a *wh*-noun. This book concludes that *dou* “all” is a predicate-related distributor and syntactically projected into DistP when associated with elements to its left and *dou* “all” expresses exhaustiveness and is an adjunct to IP syntactically when associated with a *wh*-noun to its right. The universal interpretation of a *wh*-noun to the left of *dou* “all” has been cited as empirical evidence for non-movement approach, which is against my analysis since a *wh*-noun to the right of *dou* “all” is c-commanded by *dou* “all” but has an interrogative reading.

The non-interrogative use of Chinese *wh*-phrases has received a lot of attention in literature. Chinese *wh*-phrases can be used as universal quantifiers and existential quantifiers besides their interrogative use. They get their distributive reading at [Spec,

DistP] in the process of derivation. Chinese *wh*-phrases are used as existential quantifiers in yes-no questions, A-not-A questions or imperative sentences or c-commanded by negative morpheme or epistemic adverbs. Whether *wh*-questions, alternative questions, yes-no questions and A-not-A questions are used as rhetorical questions or imperative sentences is mainly decided by pragmatic factors.

Another contribution in this book is that I provide new evidence for the classical dichotomy of QPs. A weak QP is a potential intervener for LF-movement while interaction between a strong QP and a *wh*-phrase may lead to ambiguity. Furthermore, I provide empirical and theoretical evidence to argue that a plural DP is a strong QP inspired by Daniela's (2006) study of English DPs.

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative
ACD	antecedent-contained deletion
Agr	agreement
ASP	aspect
C/Cov	Cover
CED	Condition on Extraction Domain
CL	classifier
Comp	complementizer
CONJ	conjunct inflection (subordinate clauses, <i>wh</i> -questions)
CP	complementizer projection
CQP	counting quantifier projection
D/Det	determiner
Dec	declarative
DIR	direct voice
DistP	Distributivity Projection
DP	determiner projection
DQP	distributive-universal quantifier projection
D-Structure	deep structure
ECP	empty category principle
EMPH	emphatic particle

EPP	extended projection principle
EPW	existential polarity <i>wh</i> -phrases
Foc'	intermediate focus projection
FocP	focus projection
FUT	future
GB	government and binding
GQ	generalized quantifier
GQP	group-denoting quantifier projection
IC	initial change
Infl	inflection
IP	inflection projection
LCA	lexical correspondence axiom
LF	logical form
LOC	locative
MBR	Minimal Binding Requirement
M-element	measurable-to-event element
MLC	Minimal Link Condition
MP	Minimalist Program
MSO	Multiple Spell-Out
N	noun
NEEC	Non-Entailment-of-Existence Condition on EPWs
NEG	negative

NOM	nominative
NP	noun projection
NPI	negative polarity item
NQP	negative quantifier projection
O	operator
OBV	obviative third person
Past	past tense
PCC	Path Containment Condition
PP	preposition projection
PRED	predicate
PRO	a null element with the features [+anaphor, +pronominal]
pro	a null element with the features [+anaphor, -pronominal]
Q	question particle
QNP	quantificational noun phrase
QP	quantifier projection
QR	quantifier raising
QUOT	quotative particle
S	sentence
SBE	scope-bearing element
Spec	specifier
S-Structure	surface structure

t	trace
TM	Topic Marker
TNS	Tense
Top	topic
Top'	intermediate topic projection
TopP	topic projection
V	verb
v	light verb
VP	verb projection
W	witness
WCO	weak crossover
wh	interrogative
WhQP	interrogative quantifier projection
X	variable
XP	X Projection
3	proximate third person
3P	proximate third person plural

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Chinese <i>Wh</i> -Constructions	1
1.2 The Theoretical Background	3
1.3 Outline of the Book	5
Chapter 2 Two Theories of Licensing <i>Wh</i>-in-Situ	9
2.1 The Quantificational Property of <i>Wh</i> -Phrases	9
2.2 Movement Approach	10
2.2.1 QR	11
2.2.2 Arguments for Raising <i>Wh</i> -in-Situ at LF	13
2.2.3 Comments	18
2.3 Non-Movement Approach	18
2.3.1 Problems of Raising Analysis at LF within MP	18
2.3.2 Clausal Typing Hypothesis	21
2.3.3 Incorporating Unselective Binding into MP	23
2.3.4 Classification of <i>Wh</i> -Phrases	26
2.4 Summary	30
Chapter 3 Intervention Effects	32
3.1 <i>Wh</i> -Nouns and Intervention Effects	32
3.1.1 Quantifier Intervention Effects	33
3.1.2 Focus Intervention Effects	47
3.1.3 Common Properties between the Two Kinds of Interveners	52
3.2 <i>Wh</i> -Adverbs and Intervention Effects	54
3.2.1 <i>Weishenme</i> “why”	54