

論 文 の 英 文 要 旨

論文題目	Resultative Compound Verbs in Chinese - From a Viewpoint of Comparative Analyses with Resultative Compound Verbs in Japanese and English Resultative Constructions
氏 名	Shen YaMing

This study aims to reveal the semantic and syntactic structures of Chinese Resultative Compound Verbs (henceforth, RCVs) and offer a typological analysis on Resultative Predicates (RPs) in Chinese and Japanese RCVs, and the English resultative construction. This paper is structured as follows.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of Chinese RCVs: [V1 (causal/preceding event) +V2 (resultative event)]. It also provides a preliminary comparison of RPs in Chinese and Japanese RCVs with the English resultative constructions and introduces the following issues: 1) Direct Object Restriction (DOR; Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995)), 2) Subject-Oriented RPs in Chinese and Japanese, 3) Unaccusativity, 4) Agent-Oriented vs. Patient-Oriented, 5) Action-Oriented vs. Result-Oriented, and 6) Subject-Prominence vs. Topic-Prominence.

Chapter 2 explains the theoretical frameworks used in this study: 1) Lexical Semantics, 2) Lexical Conceptual Structure (LCS), 3) Event Structure types, 4) Argument Structure, and 5) Vendler (1967)'s classification of English verbs according to their lexical aspects.

Chapter 3 surveys the semantic and event structures of Japanese lexical compound verbs as a preliminary analysis in order to compare Chinese RVCs with Japanese ones from a typological perspective. According to Yumoto (2005), there are five semantic relation patterns between V1 and V2, namely 1) coordinate relation, 2) [manner + V2] relation, 3) [instrumental + V2] relation, 4) cause-result relation and 5) [object complement sentence of V2 + V2] relation. We, however, propose that a sixth type, that is, a [preceding event + resultative event] type (which we will call the TIME SEQUENTIAL type) is required in order to explain lexical compound verbs such as ‘~nokoru’ (leave, miss).

Chapter 4 surveys the syntactic structures of Japanese lexical compound verbs. First, the concept of ‘headedness’ of a word is introduced and it is shown that Japanese compound verbs are right-headed, in accordance with the Japanese syntactic structure. It is then shown that ‘headedness’ in Chinese RCVs is more difficult to define since Chinese phrase structures display a diversity in the concept of ‘headedness’: right-headedness in Noun Phrase (NP), Complementizer Phrase (CP) and Inflectional Phrase (IP), and left-headedness in Verb Phrase (VP), and Prepositional Phrase (PP).

Second, the “Transitivity Harmony Principle” (Kageyama, 1993) is introduced as a morpho-syntactic constraint and it is shown that this principle is completely language-specific and is only applicable to agglutinative type languages like Japanese.

Third, the “Subject Accord Principle” (Yumoto, 1996, and Matsumoto, 1998) is explained and is shown to be a revised version of the “Transitivity Harmony Principle” in order to explain Subject-Oriented RPs like ‘~tsukareru/kutabireru’ (be tired from~).

Fourth, the “Unaccusativity Priority Principle” (Yumoto, 2001, 2005) is introduced and it is claimed that this principle is a part of “Decausativization” (Kageyama, 1996), a mechanism which backgrounds an agent and suppresses its realization as an argument (subject). Special attention is attached to this principle since the same phenomena can be observed in Chinese RCVs, suggesting that both Japanese and Chinese are Patient-Oriented type (or *Naru* (BECOME)-type) languages.

Chapter 5 uncovers the mechanism of the word formation process of Chinese RCVs

through the examination of 1,866 examples. First, RVCs are classified into four major types in terms of their argument structures and LCSs: 1) Object-Oriented RVCs, 2) Subject-Oriented RVCs, 3) a type where no arguments of V1 are realized in the RVC, and 4) the complementation type.

Second, the semantic and syntactic structures of Chinese RCVs are examined in terms of ‘inheritance’ of arguments of V1 and V2 by the RCVs. Of particular interest is the fact that RCV either inherits its argument structure from V2 or reconstructs a new argument structure (e.g. [cause, theme/experiencer]) on the basis of a causal chain, expressed by a LCS such as [x ACT (ON y)] CAUSE [BECOME [y BE AT-z]], by which over 50% of RCVs in our corpus are formed. This causal LCS is a canonical schema in Chinese RCVs, and is very productive. It is claimed that RCVs are right-headed in terms of the inheritance of thematic roles and the lexical aspectual feature, contrary to the analysis offered by Li(1990) that V1 always determines the syntactic feature of the RVC.

Third, it is further claimed that RVCs are formed on the LCS level, but not on the level of argument structure since the thematic role, Cause/Causer, to a subject position in a sentence with RVC from the LCS level.

Chapter 6 discusses Causative/Inchoative alternations in Japanese and Chinese. We will see that Causation and Decausativization in Chinese RCVs play an important role in Causative/Inchoative alternations. First, Chinese causal transitive RCVs are formed by attaching action verbs to state verbs, e.g. 1) 断 duan (adjective, be cut, broken) → 2) adding an action verb 切 qie (transitive action verb without telicity, making an action of cutting) in the V1 position → 3) 切断 qie-duan (transitive accomplishment verb with telicity, cut). This causation process is carried out in the formation of both causative transitive verbs and accomplishment verbs.

Second, Chinese RCVs undergo “Decausativization” under the semantic condition that it is not the goal of the V1 action to cause a result event, that is, no “Telic Role in the Qualia Structure” (Kageyama, 2007) of V1, e.g. 穿破 chuan-po (wear-broken) 鞋子 xiezi (shoes). The same phenomenon is observed in Japanese RCVs, e.g. ki-bukureru (wear-swollen).

Third, the verb system in Old Chinese is also examined in order to see the process of derivation of Chinese RCVs, lexical causation and decausativization.

Fourth, we will propose that Chinese is a Patient-Oriented type language from two pieces of evidence: 1) a rich system of decausativization, and 2) statistical result which shows that 760 examples (57.8%) among 1,314 examples with RCVs has a patient subject.

In chapter 7, we will examine the typology of resultative predicates in Chinese, Japanese and English. The first issue we will discuss is whether these three languages allow Subject-Oriented RPs. We will find that Chinese and Japanese allow Subject-Oriented RPs in the cases where 1) physiological/psychological change of state is present, e.g. 累 -lei/-tsukareru (be tired from~), 惯 -guan/-nareru (get accustomed to~), and 2) decausativization has occurred, e.g. 哭湿 ku-shi (cry-wet), 喊哑 han-ya (cry-hoarse), uchi-agaru (beat-up), tsumi-kasanaru (pile-up).

Whether a language allows Subject-Oriented RPs or not is related to the following issues: 1) Agent-Oriented vs. Patient-Oriented, 2) Subject-Prominence vs. Topic-Prominence, 3) SVOC resultative construction (sentence) vs. Compound Verb (lexical unit). We will propose that both Chinese and Japanese have Patient-Orientedness, Topic-Prominence and resultative compound verbs while English has Agent-Orientedness, Subject-Prominence, and SVOC resultative construction.

The second issue is a typology of resultative predicates that is based on the implicational hierarchy of the “predictability of RPs” in terms of the lexical and pragmatic information of main verbs (Kageyama, 2007). We will see that Chinese RCVs allow the widest range of event structure compositions. In addition to the typical causal chain “cause-result” event structure, Chinese RPs also represent causeless results brought about by accident. We will see that the Principle of “Temporal Sequence Principle” proposed by Tai (1985) is a key to explaining the flexibility of Chinese RPs.

In Chapter 8, we will summarize the features of Chinese RCVs through a comparison with Japanese RCVs and the English resultative constructions. The features of Chinese RCVs are summarized as follows: 1) certain RCVs are formed as a result of

Causation from [state→change of state→causative inchoative action],

2) “Decausativization” occurs on RCVs without a “Telic role” in V1, 3) existence of Subject-Oriented RPs, and 4) Patient-Orientedness in sentences with RCVs. Through these features of Chinese RCVs, we will conclude that Chinese is a Patient-Oriented type language.

All examples analyzed in the paper are provided in the following Appendixes.

- 1) The comparative corpus of Japanese lexical RCVs and corresponding Chinese expressions.
- 2) The corpus of Chinese RCVs classified according to their argument structures.
- 3) The corpus of Chinese RCV constructions: Transitive, Intransitive, Passive.
- 4) The corpus of Chinese RCV sentences with Japanese/English translations.