



Linguistic Society of Hong Kong
香港語言學學會

WORKSHOP ON CANTONESE VERBAL COMPLEMENTS

粵語補語討論會

ABSTRACTS

論文摘要

(version 1.0)

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
香港理工大學

April 28, 2001 (Saturday)

二零零一年四月二十八日 (星期六)

<http://www.cbs.polyu.edu.hk/ctswtang/tang/woc.htm>

PROGRAM OF WORKSHOP ON CANTONESE VERBAL COMPLEMENTS

粵語補語討論會

Location: W203, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

地點：香港理工大學 W203

1:00-1:40	飯田真紀（東京大學/香港中文大學） 粵語趨向動詞作補語的句法表現
1:40-2:20	歐陽偉豪（香港科技大學） 動詞後置成份“住得開”與複句的關係
break	
2:35-3:15	鄧思穎（香港理工大學） 粵語“得滯、乜滯、咁滯”是否屬於同一個家族？
3:15-3:55	黃倩萍（香港理工大學） “成”之異同——“做成單生意”與“做成單生意咁”
break	
4:10-4:50	Stephen Matthews and Tsz-Cheung Leung (University of Hong Kong) Particulization in Cantonese: an areal perspective
4:50-5:30	Peppina Po-lun Lee and Haihua Pan (City University of Hong Kong) A semantic investigation of the Cantonese <i>faan</i>
5:30-6:10	Thomas Lee (City University of Hong Kong) The scope of postverbal quantifiers

粵語趨向動詞作補語的句法表現

飯田真紀

東京大學/香港中文大學

本文主要討論粵語趨向動詞作補語的一些句法特徵,並嘗試從語義角度分析這種補語在句法上的某些限制。

粵語的趨向動詞有兩類:第一類包括“去”和“ ”(以下或稱之為“去類動詞”)。這兩個動詞表示該動作是離說話者而去,還是向說話者而來。另一類可以以“上”為代表(以下或稱之為“上類動詞”)。這些動詞可以作為上述去類動詞的補語(如“上去”),也可以做其他一般動詞的補語(如“追上”)。這類動詞還有以下幾個:“落”,“入”,“出”,“過”,“翻”,“埋”。

Yue 1972 早就指出粵語的趨向動詞不能作為“V 唔 C”可能補語否定式(C代表補語)的補語。但經過詳細一點的觀察,我們發現受限制的只限於“去類動詞”。而“上類動詞”作可能補語時,和一般的結果補語(如“食飽”的“飽”)一樣,可以自由地構成可能補語否定式。

對於以上兩種趨向動詞在句法表現上的差別,Yue 1972 從語言層次的角度作出解釋。但是我們認為“去類動詞”和“上類動詞”作為補語時在語義上有根本上的區別。“上類動詞”所具有的意義比較接近結果補語。這語義上的區別說明兩種趨向動詞對可能補語否定式的不同反應。

本文還討論了普通話的去類趨向動詞做可能補語時與粵語有哪些差異,並試圖解釋造成這些差異的原因。

動詞後置成份‘住得開’與複句的關係

歐陽偉豪
香港科技大學

現時文獻大都從體貌助詞, 補語等角度去探討粵語動詞後置成份‘住得開’在單句中的特徵(如: 張洪年 1972; Lee & Pan (2000)以全稱量化角度研究‘開’的特點), 很少探討在複句的表現(句 1-3)。包含‘住得開’的偏句不能獨立成句, 有異於單句的情況(句 4-6)。本文將討論 I)為何這些偏句在句法、意思上不完整, II)偏句事件與正句事件所發生的時間的相互關係, III)兩件事件對主語的要求, 及 IV)‘住得開’及其他複句的動詞後置成份與補語這概念的關係。

(1) 我食住飯[等小明].	(4) *我食住飯. (比較: 牆上掛住幅畫.)
(2) 你炒開 菜[就蒸埋條魚].	(5) *你炒開 菜. (比較: 我搭開呢班車.)
(3) 我燙得 衫[水都煲滾].	(6) *我燙得 衫. (比較: 佢做得我個仔.)

初步發現: (I) 擴展後的句(1-3)的偏句全部都可帶句末助詞 (句 7-9), 但字偏句單讀出現時也顯得不完整(句 10-11)。究竟複句裏的‘住得開’跟助詞 在句法、語意上有甚麼關係呢? 可否把 看作是偏句標記? 為何沒有‘住得開’的 字句又回復正確呢(句 13-15)?

(7) 我食住飯 等小明。	(10) *我食住飯 。	(13) 我食飯 。
(8) 你炒開 菜 就蒸埋條魚啦。	(11) *你炒開 菜 。	(14) 你炒 菜 。
(9) 我燙得 衫 水都煲滾。	(12) *我燙得 衫 。	(15) 我燙 衫 。

(II) 住字偏句提供一個進行中的動作為正句的背景, 不論正句描述一持續動作(句 16a), 或瞬間的動作(句 17a)。兩個動作的關係可用連詞‘一邊...一邊’連起來(b 句型)。

(16) a. 我晒住太陽睇女仔。 b. 我一邊晒住太陽, 一邊睇女仔。

(17) a. 我食住雪條()寄信。 b. 我一邊食住雪條, 一邊寄信。

開字句強調兩件事的開始時間, 而偏句事件的開始時間得比正句的開始時間早(句 18), 還有正句的開始時間依賴 偏句事件的發生時間, 可由句(18)的延續部份看出這點來。

(18) 你炒開 菜()就順便蒸埋條魚啦, 唔炒開呢, 就唔好搞條魚 。

得字句就強調事件的完結點。偏句事件差不多完成前，正句事件已經完成(這點由 Angel Chan 提供)，兩件事件的完成時間的先後不可調換(句 19a-b)。偏句事件只做了一半而正句事件早已完成，也是不可的(句 19c)。

(19) 我燙得 衫 呢， 水都煲滾 . . .

(a) . . . 即係話差唔多燙埋最後一件之前呢， 水就煲滾 喇。

(b) * . . . 即係話 水差唔多煲滾之前呢，我就燙好所有衫 喇。

(c) ?? . . . 即係話燙好一半衫件之前呢， 水已經煲滾 喇。

(III) 住字複句要求兩句的主語相同(句 20a)，所以始終有別於連詞‘一邊...一邊’的句子(句 20b)。開字複句的兩個主語可同可不同(句 21)；得字複句亦是(句 3)。

(20) a. 我食住飯[我/*你等小明]。 b. 我一邊食(住)飯，你一邊等小明。

(21) 你炒開 菜[你/小明就蒸埋條魚]。

(IV) 還有些動詞後置成份能產生複句，如句(22)的‘親’(張洪年 1972)，但句(23)的‘翻’就沒這個必要。

(22) a. 佢食飯 。 b. *佢食親飯()。 c. 佢食親飯()呢我就會好慘。

(23) a. 佢食翻飯()。

這些動詞後置成份在偏句裏正如文獻所述起 體貌助詞或補語或兩者兼有的作用。事實是正句的確要補在偏句之後，而這項補充又實在由‘住得開’引起，因而原來的單句得變成複句。在這個意義下，可否把‘住得開’看成一個補充成份的標記，標示一個句法位置來讓正句補入呢？若是，它們又為何變成這樣的標記呢？

文獻摘錄:

張洪年. 1972. 《香港粵語語法的研究》香港中文大學。

Lee, Peppina Po-Lun & Pan, Haihua. 2000. The semantics of Cantonese predicative suffix 開 *hoi*. Paper presented at Workshop on Cantonese Particles at HKPolyU 18 Nov 2000.

粵語“得滯、乜滯、咁滯”是否屬於同一個家族？

鄧思穎

香港理工大學中文及雙語學系

粵語“得滯”、“乜滯”和“咁滯”出現在述語的後面，例如(1)、(2)和(3)。本文的目的主要討論語法上“得滯”、“乜滯”和“咁滯”的一些特點，並且分析它們的異同。

文獻上有關粵語這三個“滯”的分析，有一種意見認為它們都屬於同一類型的成分。張洪年(1972)認為“得滯”和“咁滯”的“滯”是一個形容詞，引申比喻“達到極點，或者過分的意思”。他把“得滯”和“咁滯”分析為描寫補語。除了補語說外，另外一種看法是後置副詞說。根據這個看法，粵語這三個“滯”是表示程度的後置副詞(或者後置狀語)，這些後置副詞的出現一般被描寫為粵普語法差異的一大特點(高華年 1980, Peyraube 1997, 王寧、鄒曉麗 2000等)。跟補語說和後置副詞說不同，詞尾/助詞說主張“得滯”有別於“咁滯”和“乜滯”：“得滯”是一個詞尾，而“咁滯、乜滯”是助詞(李新魁等 1995, 張雙慶 1997)。

就粵語這三個“滯”的語法地位，他們既有相似的地方(功能上/意義上)，但也有差異的地方(形式上/句法上)。本文認為“得滯”意義上是一個強化補語。不過，在形態上“得”必須黏附在前面的述語，像一個詞尾。至於“乜滯”，本文認為它是動量詞/時量詞的一種，位於動詞補足語的位置。“咁滯”原本是一個副詞(或狀語)，出現在謂語的前頭。不過，經過謂語提昇，在語序上“咁滯”因此出現在謂語之後。根據“乜滯”和“咁滯”跟否定詞的域關係和動量詞/時量詞的排斥性，本文進一步認為在句法上“乜滯”應該低於“咁滯”。

本文的結論有不少理論上的啓示。首先，如果本文提出“乜滯”和“咁滯”的相對位置是正確的話，則基本上符合 Cinque (1999) 的副詞分布層階的假設。此外，如果謂語提昇的分析在粵語是成立的話，粵語跟普通話就某些句法的分歧可以得到解釋。換句話說，過去傳統語法學家所講的所謂“後置”事實上就是本文所主張的謂語提昇。

基於本文對這三個“滯”的探討，我們可以發現在粵語語法裏，就同一樣的語言現象，語法學家往往有不同的描述，特別是運用了一套像“補語、後置副詞(狀語)、詞尾、助詞”等貌似分歧，但事實上卻性質相似的術語，造成了不少的混淆。希望透過本文的論證，我們可以對粵語語法的研究和粵普差異對比有比較清楚的認識。

- (1) 碟牛肉鹹得滯。
- (2) 呢班懶鬼冇上堂乜滯。
- (3) 佢做起篇文咁滯。

‘成’之異同：“做成單生意”與“做成單生意咁”

**Same or Different: SENG4 in ‘zou6 seng4 daan1 saang1ji3’ and
‘zou6 seng4 daan1 saang1ji3 gam2’**

Cathy Sin Ping Wong

Department of English, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Native speakers of Cantonese have no problems in differentiating the different meanings of the following pairs of sentences. Nor will they have problems in comprehending the ironic undertone of the (b) sentences below:

(1a) 做成呢單生意

zou6 seng4 nei1 daan1 saang1ji3

do SENG4 this CL business

"closed the deal "

(1b) 做成呢單生意咁

zou6 seng4 nei1 daan1 saang1ji3 gam2

do SENG4 this CL business GAM2

"the deal was done in such a lousy way "

(2a) 幾經辛苦，搞成呢個 workshop

gei2 ging1 sang1fu2 gau2 seng4 nei1 go3 workshop

so_much experience difficulty organize SENG4 this CL workshop

"(we were able to) organize the workshop in spite of all the difficulties"

(2b) 幾經辛苦，搞成呢個 workshop 咁

gei2 ging1 sang1fu2 gau2 seng4 nei1 go3 workshop gam2

so_much experience difficulty organize SENG4 this CL workshop GAM2

"the workshop was organized in such an unsatisfactory way even though we had tried to overcome all the difficulties "

(3a) 開成呢個讀書小組

hoi1 seng4 nei1 go3 duk6syu1 siu2zou2

open SENG4 this CL read book small group

"the study group was organized "

(3b) 開成呢個讀書小組咁

hoi1 seng4 nei1 go3 duk6syu1 siu2zou2 gam2

open SENG4 this CL read book small group GAM2

"the study group was organized in such an unsatisfactory way "

(4a) 終於寫成 個計劃書

zung1jyu1 se1 seng4 go2 go3 gai3waat6syu1

finally write SENG4 that CL proposal

"the proposal was finally written up "

(4b) 終於寫成 個計劃書咁

zung1jyu1 se1 seng4 go2 go3 gai3waat6syu1 gam2

finally write SENG4 that CL proposal GAM2

"the proposal was finally written up but in a lousy way"

What is of interest as shown in the pairs of sentences above is that the addition of a simple particle 咁 GAM2 has completely changed the function of the verbal complement 成 SENG4 as well as the implicit attitude of the speaker. This begs the question: Are the two 成 SENG4's in these pairs of sentences the same SENG4?

This paper will first demonstrate that the verbal 'complement' 成 SENG4 in the (a) sentences is different from that in the (b) sentences. Second, the syntactic properties of the two verbal 'complements' 成 SENG4 in these pairs of sentences will be examined. Evidence will be provided to support the view that the verbal 'complement' 成 SENG4 in the (a) sentences is in fact a serial verb construction while the verbal 'complement' in the (b) sentences introduces an adjunct to the verb phrase.

Particulization in Cantonese: an areal perspective

Stephen Matthews & Tsz-Cheung Leung

University of Hong Kong

Cantonese morphemes such as *hoi1* and *dou2* as in (1-2) have traditionally been termed “verbal complements”:

(1) Lei5 tai2 hoi1 di1 laa1!

“Look on the bright side!”

(2) Ngo5 bong1 lei5 m4 dou2

“I can’t help you.”

While other verb-complement constructions have been analyzed as V-V compounds, such morphemes show a number of puzzling properties:

- (i) many ‘complements’ do not exist as verbs at all (such as *dou2* in (2), which cannot be derived synchronically from the verb *dou3* “arrive”);
- (ii) even where homophonous verbs exist, the complements can differ drastically from the verb in their semantics (e.g. *hoi1* “away” is not synchronically derivable from the verb *hoi1* “open”);
- (iii) they do not involve compounding in the usual sense, since the complements are separable from the verb, as seen in (2).

Nevertheless the verbal origin is clear in many cases. These are *ex-verbs*.

We account for these problems in terms of grammaticalization, specifically, a process of *particulization* (Matisoff 1991) which involves loss of verbal properties and the creation of a minor category of particles. The Lahu phenomena which motivate this analysis appear parallel to Cantonese:

Lahu: gà “arrive”, tua gà “manage to stand”

Cantonese: dou3 “arrive”, kei5 dou2 “manage to stand”

We show that far from being a peculiarity of Cantonese, such a process is widespread in languages of mainland southeast Asia, including Tai and Miao-Yao as well as some Tibeto-Burman languages. We also suggest that it is linked to their isolating typology: since the tonal monosyllabic morpheme structure prevents phonological reduction, the grammaticalized particles co-exist alongside their verbal sources, resulting in *divergence* (Hopper & Thompson 1993).

A Semantic Investigation of the Cantonese *Faan*

Peppina Po-lun Lee & Haihua Pan

City University of Hong Kong

The Cantonese *faan* is assumed to be one of the following in the literature: (1) a directional complement having the meaning of “back”/“in return”, which can be followed by aspectual suffixes like *-zo* (cf. Cheung (1972), Matthews & Yip (1994) etc.) (cf. (1)); and (2) a recovery or resumptive complement, indicating the recovered form/the return of a state (cf. (2a)) or an action (cf. (2b)), which usually cannot be followed by aspectual suffixes (cf. Zhan (1958), Yuan (1960), Cheung (1972), Yue-Hashimoto (1993), Matthews & Yip (1994)). However, sentences like (3) and (6b) reveal the limitations of these analyses. The *faan*'s in predicates 高翻 in (3) and 打翻三個鐘波 in (6b) do not necessarily mean a resumption of a state/an action, since the predicates in question do not presuppose there already exists a state to which it can be returned.

- (1) 佢終於翻 佢本書 啦。
he finally get-FAAN Perf his-CL-book SFP
“He finally has his book back.”
- (2) (a) 呢幾日 天氣 暖翻 啦。 / (b) 你 做翻 你 啦。
(a) this-several-day POSS weather warm-FAAN-er SFP / (b) you do-FAAN you-POSS-thing SFP
(a) “It gets warmer these days.” / (b) “Get back to what you should have doing.”
- (3) 近排 個靚仔 好似 高翻 囉 喎。
recently that-CL-kid like tall-FAAN-er SFP SFP
“That kid seems to have grown taller recently.”
- (4) (a) 佢 近排 後生翻 啦。 / (b) *佢 近排 老翻 啦。
(a) he recently young-FAAN SFP / (b) he recently old-FAAN SFP
(a) “He looks younger recently.”
- (5) (a) *佢 識翻 日文 啦。 / (b) *佢 死翻 啦。
(a) he know-FAAN Japanese SFP / (b) he die-FAAN SFP
- (6) (a) *佢 打翻 三個鐘波 啦。
he play-FAAN three-CL-hour-ballgame SFP
(b) 見得閒, 等我 打翻 三個鐘波 先。
see-free wait me play-FAAN three-CL-hour-ballgame SFP
“Since I am free, let's have a three-hour-ballgame.”

This paper focuses on the semantics of the Cantonese *faan*. We argue that the semantics of *faan* can be unified as marking either “a change-out-of-state” or recurrence of the event in question. When the situation in question involves a resultative state (RS), *faan* marks “a change-out-of-state”; otherwise it marks recurrence of the situation. Our claim is supported by the following.

- Three concepts, “recovery of situations”, “change-out-of-state” and “recurrence of situations”, need to be distinguished. The representation of “recovery” is $[S_1 \rightarrow \text{not } S_1 \rightarrow S_1]$, and that of “recurrence” is $[S_1 \rightarrow S_1]$ where S represents situations. Hence, “recovery” requires there is a change-out-of-state into $[\text{not } S_1]$ between the

two S_1 's. "Recurrence" simply requires the situations in question occur at least once again, and does not necessarily encode a change-out-of-state. Moreover, the semantic representation of "change out of state" is $[\text{not } S_1 \rightarrow S_1]$, and unlike "recovery", it does not presuppose the pre-existence of S_1 . Based on these definitions, we think that the previous claim of *faan* marking "recovery" is inaccurate, since the semantics of *faan* does not entail the pre-existence of S_1 and thus not "recovery".

- The incompatibility of *faan* with statives with no possible "change-out-of-state" (cf. (4b) & (5a)), and the "once-only" achievements (cf. (5b)) supports our analysis. In (4b) and (5a), since once an individual enters into the "old" state and the state of "knowing Japanese", s/he is unlikely to be out of those states, and *faan* is thus incompatible with 老 and 識日文. This claim is further supported by the well-formedness of (4a) with 後生, since unlike 老, when one enters into the "young" state, s/he is always possible to be out of that state to some other states like the "old" state. Similarly, (5b) is ill-formed because once an individual enters into the RS of 死, ie. "being dead", s/he is unlikely to be out of that state again, and 死 is thus incompatible with *faan*.
- Moreover, the incompatibility of *faan* with accomplishments bounded by quantized objects, temporal adverbials and spatial adverbials further supports our analysis (cf. (6a)). The ill-formedness of (6a) is due to the fact that this kind of accomplishments generally does not involve a RS, and thus no change-out-of-state. On the other hand, they are events unlikely to recur, except under habitual readings which are difficult to get. However, the relevant co-occurrence is possible when *faan* co-occurs with the SFP *sin*, as shown in (6b). A plausible explanation is that the anteriority meaning conveyed by *sin* implies a subsequent event following, forcing the situation 打三個鐘波 to reach its final endpoint.
- Finally, in our account, we need not differentiate *faan* as a directional complement (cf. (1)) from *faan* as a recovery complement (cf. (2)) as suggested in the literature. (1) involves the achievement verb 收, and the relevant RS is "the recovery of the book". *Faan* in (1) indicates a change out of the state "the non-recovery of the book" to the state "recovery of the book". Similarly, in (2a), *faan* marks a change out of the state "a less warmer weather" to the state of "a warmer weather". In (2b), since 做你 is an activity, there is no RS, and the predicate denotes a situation able to recur, thus compatible with *faan*. Besides, our account can also explain the well-formedness of (3) which involves no recovery of situations: *Faan* in (3) marks a change out of the state "being less taller", or even "not tall", to the state of "being taller".

The scope of postverbal quantifiers: further remarks on ‘saai3’

Thomas Hun-tak Lee
City University of Hong Kong

Given that the postverbal particle ‘saai3’ in Cantonese, denoting universality, enters into the negation and potential structures [V-m4-X] and [V-dak1-X], which are diagnostic environments for verb complements, one has good reason to consider the particle a verb complement, and the [V-saai] combination a kind of verb compound. However, all previous analyses of the particle (Lee 1994, 1995; Tang 1996, Auyeung 1998, Pan and Man 1998) have regarded the particle as a universal quantifier, implying a rejection of the verb compound analysis. In the analysis of ‘saai3’ as a quantifier, however, a number of controversies remain with respect to the kinds of elements quantified by ‘saai3’ and its scope of operation. For example, some claim that the particle can quantify the subject only when no internal argument is found within the VP (Tang 1996), but Lee (1994) and Pan and Man (1998) do not consider this restriction to be valid. Some argue that the particle quantifies over events (Tang 1996), whereas in most analyses, the particle is seen as an operator that quantifies over individuals (Lee 1994, 1995).

In this paper, I examine data that will clarify the nature and scope of ‘saai’³. Specifically, I will argue that, in a spirit akin to Pan and Man (1998), the particle can quantify over the subject or a preverbal NP in an adjunct, or prepositional and indirect objects, as long as a kind reading is permitted. I will observe systematic differences between ‘saai3’ and the adverbial universal quantifier ‘dou’ which suggest that the former differs from the latter in lacking the distributor property (contrary to the claim of Tang 1996). The lack of distributivity of the particle and its syntactic position explain why it cannot quantify over indirect A-not-A and disjunctive questions, but can do so over wh-clausal complements. It also explains why unlike the adverbial quantifier ‘dou1’, the particle can occur in an A-not-A question. In contexts with two quantifiers, in which one is quantified by ‘saai3’, the particle has the effect of reducing the availability of a wide scope reading. The relative scope of ‘saai3’ and modals and negation (appearing in preverbal position and within the VP) poses serious problems for any analysis that treats the particle as a verb complement. Our data taken as a whole also allow us to reevaluate the event-quantifier analysis of ‘saai3’.