

This Honours Thesis represents my own work and due acknowledgement is given in footnotes whenever information is derived from other sources. No part of this Honours Thesis has been or is being concurrently submitted for any other qualification at any other University.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my supervisor K.P. Mohanan without whom this thesis would have read like Edward Lear's "Complete Nonsense". He has devoted so much time and effort to teaching me both in this research and in writing it that my labours will never be able to match. I can only aspire to be like him if I ever become a teacher. Thanks also to Tara Mohanan. Though I have not troubled her, I know she had troubled herself helping me indirectly, the extent of which I am not even certain. Special thanks to Vivienne Fong and Zhang Min for their insightful and helpful comments and for making clear to me various issues.

I am grateful to my classmates, Chin Seok Koon, Lim Chong Shen and Sim Weishun for battles fought in class, forcing me to see where my analysis might be inadequate. Weishun's sympathetic ear deserves special mention, without which writing this thesis would make me age.

My informants Karene Wong Shiow Chyang, Wong Mei Ling, Ng Kum Hoon and Sim Weishun are god-sent. Their patience and almost masochistic willingness have been amazing. Big thanks to Chong Shen, Meiling, Shujun and Weishun again for proof reading within unreasonable time.

Above all, thank you daddy, mummy, my brother Lian Chian and darling Michelle for your love, support and taking over my share of household chores, a huge incentive to thesis writing.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
CONTENTS	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Introducing the Constructions	2
1.1. A Note on <i>De</i> , <i>Dao</i> and <i>Le</i>	8
1.2. Earlier Treatments of <i>De</i>, <i>Dao</i> and <i>Le</i>	9
1.2.1. The <i>De</i> of Loh (1996)	10
1.2.2. The <i>Dao</i> of Tham (1996)	12
1.2.3. The <i>Le</i> of L. Wee (1997)	15
1.2.4. V-V Resultatives in Li (1990)	20
1.3. Organization of the Thesis	22
CHAPTER TWO GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIAL CONSTITUENCY	23
2.1. The Constituency	23
2.1.1. The Constituency of Separable PRC	23
2.1.2. The Constituency of Joint PRC	27
2.1.3. The Constituency of Verb-copying PRC	29
2.2. Whose Hand Broke?	31
2.2.1. Separable PRC	31
2.2.2. Verb-copying PRC	32
2.3. Summary	34

CHAPTER THREE	ARGUMENT STRUCTURES AND GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIONS	35
3.1.	The Verbs	35
3.2.	The Argument Structures of <i>De</i> , <i>Dao</i> and <i>Le</i>	36
3.3.	Putting Together the Argument Structures	38
3.4.	The Grammatical Functions	40
3.4.1.	Separable PRC	40
3.4.1.1.	Anaphors and Pronominals	40
3.4.1.2.	The GF Status of the Resultative Phrase	42
3.4.2.	Joint PRC	44
3.4.2.1.	A Digression: On Complex Predicates	45
3.4.3.	Verb-copying PRC	47
3.5.	Linking the ARG STR to the GF STR	49
3.5.1.	Separable PRC	49
3.5.2.	Joint PRC	51
3.5.3.	Verb-copying PRC	52
3.6.	Summary	53
CHAPTER FOUR	SEMANTIC REPRESENTATIONS	55
4.1.	Theoretical Assumptions	55
4.1.1.	The Organization of Grammar	55
4.1.2.	The SEM STR	58
4.1.2.1.	Deriving the SEM STR	58
4.1.2.2.	The Formation Rules of SEM STR	61
4.2.	SEM STR of the Verbs, Constructions and Particles	62
4.2.1.	SEM STR of Verbs	62
4.2.2.	Determining if the Verbs Carry Presuppositions	63
4.2.3.	Determining if the Constructions Carry Presuppositions	64
4.2.3.1.	Presuppositions of Separable PRC	64

4.2.3.2.	Presuppositions of Joint PRC	66
4.2.3.3.	Presuppositions of Verb-copying PRC	68
4.2.4.	Semantic Representation of the Constructions	70
4.2.5.	Semantic Representation of the Particles	71
4.3.	Summary	73
CHAPTER FIVE	FITTING THE SEMANTIC PIECES	74
5.1.	The Particle <i>De</i>, the Verbs and the Constructions	74
5.1.1.	The Interaction	74
5.1.1.1.	Some Supporting Evidence	77
5.1.1.2.	NIC and Theta Identification	79
5.1.2.	<i>De</i> as a Modal	81
5.1.3.	Resultative and Descriptive Complements of <i>De</i>	82
5.1.4.	Representing the <i>De</i> -sentences	83
5.2.	The Particle <i>Dao</i>, the Verbs and the Constructions	85
5.2.1.	Representing the <i>Dao</i> -sentences	87
5.3.	The Particle <i>Le</i>, the Verbs and the Constructions	89
5.3.1.	Representing the <i>Le</i> -sentences	90
5.4.	Summary	91
CHAPTER SIX	CONCLUSION	93
6.1.	A Summary	93
6.2.	Theoretical Implications	96
REFERENCES		98

ABBREVIATIONS

AP	adjectival phrase
ASP	aspectual marker
comp	complementizer
CL	classifier
Interj	interjection
N	noun
NP	noun phrase
NEG	negation
POSS	possessive marker
PP	preposition phrase
prt	particle
Q	question marker
V	verb
VP	verb phrase

ABSTRACT

In Mandarin, particles *de*, *dao* and *le* can introduce a resultative phrase yielding a

Particle Resultative Construction (PRC) exemplified in (1b,c):

1. a. Lear da Caesar.
 Lear hit Caesar.
 Lear hits/hit/is hitting/is to hit Caesar.
- b. Lear da **de** / **dao** Caesar [shou duan].
 Lear hit **DE/DAO** Caesar [hand break].
 Lear hit Caesar and as a result broke *Caesar's* hand.
- c. Lear da **le** Caesar [shou duan].
 Lear hit **LE** Caesar [hand break].
 Lear hit Caesar and as a result broke *Lear's* hand.
- d.* Lear da Caesar [shou duan].
 Lear hit Caesar [hand break].

The construction exhibits a number of theoretically intriguing properties. For instance, note that particles license the resultative phrase ((1d)). Depending on the particle used, the NP that the resultative phrase is predicated of differs ((1b) vs. (1c)). Interestingly, the subject of the resultative phrase, *shou* 'hand', must be inalienably possessed by a participant of the event denoted by the verb *da* 'hit'.

Using detailed semantic representations, this thesis shows that the inalienable relation can be captured by appealing to a difference in prominence of semantic participants. I will also show that the choice of the possessor NP is found in grammatical categorial constituency structure as the nearest c-commanding NP of the possessed NP. The analysis applies also to the inalienable relation between two syntactically split objects in other resultative constructions such as the Mandarin split object *ba*-construction and V-V resultatives.

On the basis of a detailed analysis of the facts of PRC-s, this thesis argues that meanings of causation, presupposition and also the number of grammatical functions are stipulated on the constructions (PRC-s) themselves, this information being unobtainable from constituent morphemes. However, the meanings of the morphemes and their valency must be projected to give flesh to the constructions. This analysis is thus at once constructionist (Goldberg 1995) and projectionist (Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1996).