

第二屆漢語形式語義研究 國際研討會

**The 2nd International Symposium on
Formal Approaches to Meaning in Chinese**

時間： 2023年6月20日-21日

地點： 香港中文大學馮景禧樓太古堂二號演講廳

會議主辦：香港中文大學語言學及現代語言系

Organizer



Department of
Linguistics and Modern Languages
語言學及現代語言系

Co-sponsor



會議議程

日期：2023 年 6 月 20 日（星期二下午）

會議地點：香港中文大學馮景禧樓太古堂二號演講廳

時間	議程	
13:30-14:00	聽眾於會議現場簽到	
14:00-14:10	潘海華教授致辭、與會者合影	
第一場 主持人：胡建華		
14:10-14:50	主旨演講： 安大簡《曹沫之陳》里的 “  ”	程邦雄
14:50-15:30	主旨演講： 漢語類指成分的庫藏地位及其句法後果	劉丹青
15:30-16:00	特邀演講： 漢語句子中否定算子與其他算子的共現	陳振宇
16:00-16:20 茶歇 (馮景禧樓 G24 室)		
第二場 主持人：劉明明		
16:20-16:50	特邀演講： The Semantics of Accented/Unaccented Variants of Chinese Focus Particles	Yuan Shen
16:50-17:20	特邀演講： A Semantic Study on Cantonese and Mandarin Approximatives: Are They the Same or Different?	Po-lun Lee
17:20-17:40	Maintaining Mandarin <i>hen</i> as a Weak Intensifier	Yenan Sun
17:40-18:00	Rhetorical Copular Questions: Between Semantics and Pragmatics	Haoze Li, W.-T.Tsai
18:00-18:20	Event Definiteness and The Temporal Interpretation of <i>Shi-de</i> Clefts in Mandarin Chinese	Xue Xia

會議議程

日期：2023 年 6 月 21 日（星期三上午）

會議地點：香港中文大學馮景禧樓太古堂二號演講廳

時間	議程	
08:30-09:00	聽眾於會議現場簽到	
第三場 主持人：程邦雄		
09:00-09:40	主旨演講（線上）： 關於語義形式化的問題	李宇明
09:40-10:10	特邀演講： 「都」：從甚至到總括	劉明明
10:10-10:30	Mandarin <i>mou</i> at the Syntax-semantics Interface: A Presuppositional Question-based Analysis	Bo Xue
10:30-10:50	How to Obtain Valid Generalized Modal Syllogisms from Valid Generalized Syllogisms	Ran Xia, Jing Xu
10:50-11:10 茶歇 (馮景禧樓 G24 室)		
第四場 主持人：陳振宇		
11:10-11:30	複數分裂與人稱代詞複數的類型	劉星
11:30-11:50	Cross-linguistic Variations in the Interpretation of Proportional Quantifiers: A Corpus-based Study of <i>most</i> , <i>more than half</i> , <i>dabufen</i> , and <i>daduosu</i>	Lei Chu, Yuli Feng
11:50-12:10	Donkey Sentences in Chinese: In Defense of the Null Hypothesis	Hang Kuang, Haihua Pan

會議議程

日期：2023 年 6 月 21 日（星期三下午）

會議地點：香港中文大學馮景禧樓太古堂二號演講廳

時間	議程	
第五場 主持人：沈園		
14:00-14:40	主旨演講（線上）： 多聲性標記“並”的反向並列意義及其歷史來源	袁毓林
14:40-15:10	特邀演講： 再論量詞的語義：數詞說和名詞說	李旭平
15:10-15:30	The Implication of Plural Eventualities on Tense in Mandarin	Yuyin He
15:30-15:50	<i>Wh</i> -relatives as <i>wh</i> -interrogatives in Mandarin Chinese: Dynamicity, Interrogativity and Intensionality	Qianqian Ren
15:50-16:10 茶歇（馮景禧樓 G24 室）		
第六場 主持人：李旭平		
16:10-16:40	特邀演講： 語氣副詞“實在”的量級語義學分析	王瑩瑩
16:40-17:20	主旨演講（線上）： 作為顯義的本義	蔣嚴
17:20-17:40	A QUD-based Approach to Mandarin <i>dou</i>	Chengyu Tsai
17:40-18:20	主旨演講： Focus Sensitivity and Exhaustivity in Quantification	Jianhua Hu
會議結束		

會議摘要

安大簡《曹沫之陳》裡的“𠂔”

程邦雄

華中科技大學 中國語言研究所

電子信箱：cbx577@126.com

摘要：

安大簡《曹沫之陳》裡的𠂔字，與郭店簡的𠂔、上博簡的𠂔、𠂔、𠂔、𠂔、𠂔等是同一個字，安大簡的𠂔和上博簡等的𠂔等所組成的語言單位也基本相同，並與傳世文獻的“(身)免”、“免身”、“身不免”、“其身不免”、“免其身”等表達形式相對應，𠂔所處的語境也與𠂔等完全一致，因此，𠂔也應與𠂔等一樣，釋讀為“免”字。安大簡、上博簡的𠂔、𠂔異文，𠂔更符合文本原型，𠂔可能是傳抄轉寫中出現的訛誤。全文分兩部分：一、釋“𠂔”；二、𠂔與𠂔的異文問題。

關鍵字：安大簡 曹沫之陳 𠂔 免

參考文獻：

程邦雄 鄧珍 2020 上博楚簡《鬼神之明》裡的“免”，《語文研究》第3期。

程邦雄 徐清清 2022 楚簡《三德》裡的𠂔、𠂔，〈《語言研究》第3期〉。

徐在國 黃德寬 1999 郭店楚簡文字續考，〈《江漢考古》第2期〉。

陳斯鵬 1999 讀郭店楚墓竹簡筭記（10則），〈《中山大學學報論叢》第6期〉。

張光裕 1999 《郭店楚簡研究》，臺灣藝文印書館。

周鳳五 1999 郭店楚墓竹簡唐虞之道新釋，〈《中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊》第70本第3分〉。

李零 2022 《郭店楚簡校讀記》，北京大學出版社。

張桂光 2001 《郭店楚墓竹簡》釋注續商榷，〈《簡帛研究》〉，廣西師範大學出版社。

張桂光 2004 《古文字學論集》，中華書局。

廖名春 2005 讀楚竹書《曹沫之陳》筭記，簡帛研究網2月12日。

劉釗 2005 《郭店楚簡校釋》，福建人民出版社。

高佑仁 2005 談《唐虞之道》與《曹沫之陣》的“沒”字，武漢大學簡帛網，網址：
<http://www.bsm.org.cn/>。

高佑仁 2006 《曹沫之陣》“沒身就世”釋讀，逢甲大學第十七屆文字學學術研討會《文字的俗寫現象及多元性——第十七屆中國文字學全國學術研討會論文集》。

邴尚白 2006 《〈上博楚竹書·曹沫之陣〉注釋》，臺灣大學《中國文學研究》第二十一集。

趙平安 2001 從楚簡“媿”的釋讀談到甲骨文的“媿”——附釋古文字中的“冥”，《簡帛研究》，廣西師範大學出版社。

朱承平 2005 《異文類語料的鑒別與應用》，嶽麓書社。

Cross-linguistic variation in the interpretation of proportional quantifiers: A corpus-based study of *most*, *more than half*, *dabufen*, and *daduoshu*

Lei Chu

Yuli Feng

Department of English Language and Literature, Fudan University

Email: fengyuli@fudan.edu.cn

This paper probes into the semantic interpretation of four cross-linguistically related *most*-type proportional quantifiers (i.e., *most*, *more than half*, *dabufen*, and *daduoshu*), paying particular attention to cases where the expressions correspond to proportions below 50%. Given that the GQT definitions cannot explain the differences of the expressions in terms of their proportional ranges (cf. Hackl 2009; Solt 2016), this paper opts for an internal-compositional approach which better explains the relation between the distribution of percentages represented by the four *most*-type quantifiers and their different morphological makeups. In particular, a new mechanism for interpretation based on comparative adjectival semantics is proposed drawing on the Chinese data of *dabufen* and *daduoshu*.

The corpus study: The corpus investigation shows that the proportional ranges of bare *most*, *more than half*, bare *dabufen*, and bare *daduoshu* partially overlap with each other. *More than half* shows an approximately exclusive usage for percentages between 50% and 65%, while *most* presents a broader distribution from percentages below 50% to near 100%. *Dabufen* and *daduoshu* reflect parallel patterns to the distribution of *most*. *Most*, *dabufen*, and *daduoshu* but not *more than half* can express proportions below 50% given appropriate contextual support. *Most* requires that the proportion it expresses be the **largest** as compared to other portions in a partition; while *dabufen* and *daduoshu* do not exert such a strict requirement.

Three mechanisms for interpretation: Three mechanisms for interpretation surface out when we try to relate the expressions' ways of internal composition with their proportional ranges: (i) The GQT analysis which posits the quantifiers as semantic primitives treats the expressions as logical equivalents and cannot explain their subtle differences with respect to proportions; (ii) The superlative adjectival analysis which is anchored in the internal composition of *most* as *many+est* can explain why *most* always selects the largest part in a partition; (iii) The comparative adjectival analysis fits better with Chinese *dabufen* and *daduoshu*, both of which do not encode superlative morphology and derive their proportional reading via comparison with a neutral range determined by the context.

The contribution of this paper is two-fold. First, it conducts a meticulous investigation into proportional ranges represented by the four *most*-type proportional quantifiers and compares their distributional patterns and contextual requirements. Second, by adding Chinese *dabufen* and *daduoshu* into the cross-linguistic landscape of proportional quantifiers, the variation of *most*-type quantifiers is further explored through the analysis of their respective internal composition and derivation of quantificational meanings.

References

- Hackl, M. 2009. On the grammar and processing of proportional quantifiers: *most* versus *more than half*. *Natural Language Semantics*, 17, 63-98.
- Solt, S. 2016. On measurement and quantification: The case of *most* and *more than half*. *Language*, 92, 65-100.

漢語句子中否定算子與其他算子的共現

陳振宇

復旦大學中國語言文學系

電子信箱：chenzhenyu@fudan.edu.cn

顯性否定句是有一個否定的規約形式的句子，如“三班的學生沒有買數學書”“沒有三班的學生買了數學書”。從邏輯上講，不論否定詞在哪個句法位置（D 量詞或者 A 量詞），都可以使得所有的論元（包括事件論元）獲得否定性的全稱量化語義。例如：所有三班的學生都沒有買數學書——所有數學書三班的同學都沒有買——所有買的事三班的同學都沒有對數學書實施。因此，這些論元都是單調下降（向下蘊涵）的。為了解釋這一點，可以將否定算子在邏輯式中移位到整個肯定命題的最前面。

但是，我們可以按照否定詞是否在句法上管轄該論元分為兩種情況：1）直接量化，主要由算子的語義直接導致算子所約束的成分達到或基本達到量化的要求（有時，可能需要一定的輔助），所以算子必須約束被量化的 X 成分。2）間接量化，有時沒有算子，而且即使有算子，也並不約束被量化的成分；主要依靠語用規則來實現量化。以「三班的學生沒有買數學書」為例，如果在相應的量化成分上加上其他不同性質的算子，會有以下三種情況：

- 1) 三班的學生沒有經常買數學書=三班的學生偶爾買數學書（“買”單調下降）三班的學生沒有都買數學書=三班的學生有的買了數學書（“三班的學生”單調上升）“否定算子（寬）+新算子（窄）”一定要融合成一個算子。三班的學生經常沒有買數學書（“買”單調上升）三班的學生都沒有買數學書（“三班的學生”單調下降）
- 2) 有的三班的學生沒有買數學書（“三班的學生”單調上升）至少兩個三班的同學沒有買數學書（“三班的學生”單調上升）最多兩個三班的同學沒有買數學書（“三班的學生”單調下降）“新算子（寬）+否定算子（窄）”不能融合成一個算子。
- 3) 三班的同學沒有買所有的數學書=三班的同學買了部分的數學書（融合——“數學書”單調上升）“否定算子（寬）+新算子（窄）”三班的同學沒有買所有的數學書（不融合——“數學書”單調下降）“新算子（寬）+否定算子（窄）”三班的同學沒有買部分的數學書（不融合——“數學書”單調上升）“新算子（寬）+否定算子（窄）”

我們認為，凡是發生算子融合的就是直接量化，不融合的是間接量化。

- 1) 因為「沒有」在狀語位置，在漢語中，它首先作用的是謂詞; 對於主語，一定在其管轄範圍之外，所以是間接量化; 對賓語，既可以解釋為在管轄之內，也可以解釋為在管轄之外，所以既可能是直接量化，也可以是間接量化。
- 2) 不融合時，由外層的算子決定單調性。

The Implication of Plural Eventualities on Tense in Mandarin

Yuyin He

Beijing Language and Culture University

Email: heyuyin@blcu.edu.cn

1. Introduction Like many superficially tenseless languages, the non-future constraint on time adverbs with bare predicates in root clauses supports a tensed analysis for Mandarin. In principle, a covert non-future tense and a null version of the English tense system (i.e. a covert present and a covert past tense) make the same prediction on licensing non-future time adverbs (Matthewson 2006, Reis Silva & Matthewson 2007 etc.). Sun (2014) suggests that the NONFUT is superior to two null tenses in accounting for plural eventualities in different temporal locations (PEDT henceforth). The Mandarin example in (1) is natural to describe a past state of the dead (Hawking) and a present state of the living (Yang). To capture PEDT, NONFUT succeeds in providing an interval that covers past and present while the latter fails to offer two different temporal locations.

(1) Huojin he Yang Zhenning dou dui wuli ganxingqu.

Hawking and Yang Zhenning DOU to physics interest

‘Hawking and ZhenningYang were/are interested in physics.’

(Mandarin, adapted from Sun 2014)

We find that PEDT is blocked when the predicate is stage-level (s-stative), a pattern unattested in other tenseless languages. For instance, the sentence in (2) with an s-stative shares the same structure as (1), but prohibits PEDT. With a dead experiencer in the coordinated subject, only the past reading is available. This talk suggests that a two-null-tense account can also derive the pattern in (1)-(2). Mandarin is not committed to a NONFUT tense analysis.

(2) Huojin he Yang Zhenning dou hen lei.

Hawking and Yang Zhenning DOU very tired

‘Hawking and Zhenning Yang were/ #are tired.’ / ‘#Hawking was tired and Zhenning Yang is tired.’

2. The Proposal The sentence in (1) does not argue against the two-null-tense approach. English apparently possesses two tenses and it occasionally allows a dead subject to go with present tense, especially when the predicate is individual-level. Other than that, English allows the ‘historical present’ usage in which present tense is compatible with a past narration. Hence an account for English present is possible to extend to the Mandarin data in (1).

To capture (2), we assume tense to be referential (Partee 1973,1984). A tense operator carries an index to pick out a context salient time $g(i)$ via the assignment function g , iff $g(i)$ satisfies some presupposition. The English-like PRES and PAST are shown below.

(3) a. $\llbracket \text{PRES}_i \rrbracket^{c,w,g} = g(i)$, defined if and only if $g(i) = t_c$.

b. $\llbracket \text{PAST}_i \rrbracket^{c,w,g} = g(i)$, defined if and only if $g(i) < t_c$.

The instantaneous PRES (Bennett & Partee 1978) in (3a) returns t_c and the PAST in (3b) requires $g(i)$ to precede t_c (t_c is often the instantaneous utterance time s^* in a matrix clause). We assume that though (2) is morphologically unmarked by aspect markers, it possesses a covert imperfective aspect IPFV (Lin 2006), with a standard semantics in (4). Following Liu (2018) and Xiang (2020), we propose that

the distributive reading comes from a covert distributive operator (Link 1983) with the semantics in (5). *Dist* requires a given property *P* to hold for any atom of a plural entity *x*. *Dou* in (1)-(2) is a focus particle whose contribution is irrelevant here.

$$(4) \quad \llbracket \text{IPFV} \rrbracket = \lambda P \lambda t \lambda w \exists e [P(e)(w) \wedge t \subseteq \tau(e)] \quad (5) \quad \llbracket \text{Dist} \rrbracket = \lambda P \lambda x \forall y [(y \sqsubseteq x \wedge \text{Atom}(y)) \rightarrow P(y)]$$

With the structure in (6a), the denotation in (6b) requires *g(i)* to be in the runtime of two states by different experiencers, which can only be satisfied when the two states overlap. Therefore, PEDT is excluded. Either present or past reading is available depending on the tense. S-statives like ‘tired’ presuppose that the experiencer is alive if the state holds (Musan 1997, Magri 2009), hence the present reading is infelicitous if one of the experiencer is dead in (2).

$$(6) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{a. } [\text{FocP } \textit{dou} [\text{coordinated subject } [\text{DistP } \text{Dist} [\lambda x [\text{TP } \text{TENSE}_i [\text{AspP } \text{IPFV} [\text{AdjP }]]]]]]] \\ \text{b. } \forall x [(x \sqsubseteq h \oplus y \wedge \text{Atom}(x)) \rightarrow \exists s [\text{tired}(s, x, w) \wedge g(i) \subseteq \tau(s)]] \end{array}$$

Focus Sensitivity and Exhaustivity in Quantification

Jianhua Hu

Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

Email: ctjhu@126.com

It has been observed that the English universal A-quantifiers *always* and *only* exhibit different properties in terms of sensitivity and exhaustivity in focus interpretation. While *always* allows for a non-exhaustive interpretation, *only* can only have an exhaustive interpretation when associated with focus. Under Beaver and Clark's (2003) analysis, the difference between *always* and *only* is accounted for by the former one's dependency on the context and the latter one's lexical encoding of a dependency on focus. This paper shows that besides these two kinds of A-quantifiers, Chinese has another type of A-quantifiers that can be grouped into neither the *always*-type nor the *only*-type in distribution and interpretation. These A-quantifiers may be termed as the intermediate type of A-quantifiers when compared with those at the two opposite sides represented by *zong(shi)* and *zhi* respectively. The intermediate type of A-quantifiers, represented by *dou*, bears the universal quantificational force as do *zong(shi)* and *zhi*, the Chinese counterparts to the English *always* and *only*. For instance, in the following sentence, *dou* may occur either with or without being associated with a focus.

(1) Ta dou shuo English. "He only speaks English/He always speaks English."

If the object NP *English* bears focus, (1) may arguably have the meaning that *he only speaks English*, though this interpretation may actually turn out to be a theoretical illusion, as *dou* may not be treated as *only* even in this specific context. In addition to this reading, (1) has another interpretation where *English* is not in focus. In the latter reading, *dou* can be interpreted as *always*, which, as an adverb of quantification, may have the following representation (Pan 2006).

(2) DOU[s ∈ set of situations][he speaks English in s]
 $\forall s [s \in \text{set of situations} \rightarrow \text{he speaks English in } s]$

It is shown that while *zong(shi)* and *zhi* are clearly distinguished with respect to focus sensitivity and exhaustivity, the intermediate type of A-quantifiers often blurs such a distinction. Although *dou* sometime behaves like *zong(shi)* and sometimes behaves like *zhi*, it may not be treated as a counterpart to either of them. (3) shows that the replacement of *zong(shi)* by *dou* would result in contradiction in interpretation of the two clauses linked by *ye* 'also', and (4) shows that *dou* cannot be used as *zhi* when there is an aspect marker such as *guo* or *le* in the sentence.

- (3) a. ta zong(shi) qu [Beida]^F ting baogao, ta ye zong(shi) qu [Tsinghua]^F ting baogao.
 "He always goes to Peking University to attend lectures, and he also always goes to Tsinghua University to attend lectures."
 b. ?? ta dou qu [Beida]^F ting baogao, ta ye dou qu [Tsinghua]^F ting baogao.
- (4) a. ta zhi qu guo/le [Beida]^F ting baogao.
 "He only went to Peking University to attend lectures"
 b. *ta dou qu guo/le [Beida]^F ting baogao.

In this paper, we argue that *dou* and *zong(shi)* occupy different syntactic positions and are thus operators that bind different kinds of variables: *dou* is an event variable binder whereas *zong(shi)* is a situation variable binder. Under our analysis, the focus sensitivity of *zong(shi)* and *dou* are parasitic

on their respective binding of situation variables and event variables. An important point to notice is that their occurrence in the sentence may not require focus association. In this respect, *zhi* differs from *zong(shi)* and *dou* fundamentally. *Zhi* may occur without binding a situation variable or an event variable, but it must be associated with the focus, given that its occurrence must be licensed by the placement of focus.

References

Beaver, David and Brady Clark. 2003. *Always* and *only*: why not all focus-sensitive operators are alike. *Natural Language Semantics* 11: 323-362.

A semantic study on Cantonese and Mandarin approximatives: Are they the same or different?

Peppina Po-lun Lee
Hong Kong Metropolitan University
Email: pllee@hkmu.edu.hk

Previous analyses consider English adverbs “almost” and “barely” as “approximative adverbs”. The semantic and pragmatic properties of this pair of adverbs have been the subject of much debate in the literature. To capture the meaning differences between the pair, previous literature proposed a “Conjunctive Analysis”, which is the conjunction of two propositions that instantiate two meaning components, namely the proximal component and the polar component (see e.g. Sadock 1986, Schwenter 2002, Horn 2002, Nouwen 2006, Amaral 2010, Amaral & del Pe 2010).

This paper aims to review approximatives in Cantonese and Mandarin Chinese. We will start with the semantics of Cantonese approximative sentence-final particles (SFPs) *mat1zai3* ‘MATZAI’ and *gam3zai3* ‘GAMZAI’, which have their meaning predominantly determined by the polarity of the proposition and the presence of an additional minimal meaning not identified in previous analyses of “almost” and “barely”. Following the line of *mat1zai3* and *gam3zai3*, we aim to come up with an analysis unifying observations gleaned from approximatives in Mandarin, including *chabuduo* “almost”, *cha(yi)dian* “almost”, and *cha(yi)dian-mei* “almost-NEG”, with the three showing significant parametric variations.

To begin with, in the case of Cantonese approximative SFPs, *mat1zai3* and *gam3zai3* are highly sensitive to polarity and demonstrate varying distribution in affirmative and negative contexts. We argue that this polarity sensitivity is due to their semantics as scalar operators (see Isarel 1996, 2011), with their interpretations governed by two components. Like most approximatives, the first component is the proximal component, which requires the realization of the proposition came close to the proposition preadjacent to *mat1zai3* and *gam3zai3* to be true. However, the second component is not only polar component, but the polar-minimal component. It not only reverses the polarity of the preadjacent proposition, but requires the proposition to mark a point in a minimal or small interval from the low-end or the high-end of the scale, with the latter an additional meaning not recognized in previous analyses. Relevant examples are shown below.

(1) *Keoi5 mou5 heoi2 soeng5tong4 mat1zai3.*

he NEG go class MATZAI

‘He almost has not attended any classes. The number of classes he attended is minimal, just one or so.’

(2) *Ngo5 mou5 tai2-gwo3 bun2 syu1 gam3zai3.*

I NEG read-PERF CL book GAMZAI

‘I came close of not having read the book. I read the book, but read little only.’

Our analysis is extended to Mandarin approximatives *chabuduo*, *cha(yi)dian* and *cha(yi)dian-mei/bu*. Firstly, Mandarin approximatives *cha(yi)dian* and *cha(yi)dian-mei* are on a par with Cantonese *mat1zai3* and *gam3zai3*. As mentioned, Cantonese *mat1zai3* and *gam3zai3* and Mandarin *cha(yi)dian* and *cha(yi)dian-mei* have their meanings predominantly determined by the polarity of the proposition. As scalar operators, they carry the feature of polar-minimal component. A pattern similar to Cantonese *mat1zai3* and *gam3zai3* can be gleaned from Mandarin Chinese *cha(yi)dian* and *cha(yi)dian-mei*, with

the latter being more complicated. With the meaning of the negator *mei* ignored, (3a) expresses the same meaning as (3b).

he CHA-YI-DIAN die
'He almost died.' (He didn't die.)

he CHA-YI-DIAN-NEG die
'He almost died.' (He didn't die.)

For *cha(yi)dian* and *cha(yi)dian-mei*, the polar component exists in their interpretation, with the presence of the negator serving to change the direction of the scalar inferencing. *Cha(yi)dian* tends to be scale reversing, with p to $\sim p$. *Cha(yi)dian-mei* on the other hand is inherently ambiguous between scale reversing and scale preserving interpretations, possibly from $\sim p$ to p or $\sim p$ to $\sim p$, resulting in the interpretations given in (3a) and (3b). However, *chabuduo* is found to be distinct in this feature, as shown in (4).

he CHABUDUO die-PERF
'He almost died.' (He died.)

he CHABUDUO NEG die
'He almost didn't die.' (He didn't die.)

The absence of the polar component in *chabuduo* is seen in (4a) and (4b). The two sentences show that it retains the polarity of the preadjacent proposition, hence p to p or $\sim p$ to $\sim p$. *Chabuduo* bears only the minimal component, not the polar-minimal component. Although it is the minimal component that makes *chabuduo* a scalar operator, the lack of polar meaning component makes its scalar interpretation different from Cantonese approximatives and other Mandarin approximatives.

Finally, in terms of negativity, *chabuduo* also demonstrates some features distinct from other Mandarin approximatives. *Cha(yi)dian* is more natural with *mei* 'NEG' than *bu* 'NEG'. Contrarily, *chabuduo* is very restricted with negators, with *chabuduo-mei* marginally acceptable in some cases only.

Rhetorical copular questions: Between semantics and pragmatics

Haoze Li

Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

Email: haozeli.li@gmail.com

Dylan W.-T. Tsai

Rhetorical questions (RhQ) are intriguing because they have interrogative structures but do not elicit answers. They are considered a special use of the corresponding standard questions in previous research. Specifically, an ordinary question is interpreted as a RhQ when its answer is known to the speaker and the addressee (Han 2002; Rohde 2006; Caponigoro & Sprouse 2007; Biezma & Rawlins 2017). This study investigates a special rhetorical flavor of a copular question in Mandarin, as shown in (1). The speaker uttering this question is aware of Libai's identity and uses the question to convey that **the addressee has overestimated Libai's power**, rather than requesting the answer. This is supported by the subsequent continuation in (1).

- (1) Nǐ yǐwéi Lǐbái shì shéi? Tā zhǐ shì shìzhǎng zhùlǐ, chù-lǐ bù-liǎo zhè shì. you think Libai be who he only be mayor assistant handle not this thing
'Who do you think Libai is? He is only the mayor's assistant and cannot handle this.'

This RhQ presents three puzzles. First, the speaker does not exactly know what is Libai's identity in their belief, contrary to the condition of rhetorical interpretations. Second, departing from other kinds of RhQs, the syntactic position of the *wh*-expression in (1) play a nontrivial role in yielding the rhetorical interpretation. If the *wh*-expression appears as the subject of the embedded copular clause, as illustrated in (2), the rhetorical interpretation is not permissible. In this example, the question simply asks which individual the addressee incorrectly identified as Libai, rendering the same continuation in (1) inappropriate in this context.

- (2) Nǐ yǐwéi shéi shì Lǐbái? #Tā zhǐ shì shìzhǎng zhùlǐ, chù-lǐ bù-liǎo zhè shì.
you think who be Libai he only be mayor assistant handle not this thing
'Who do you think is Libai? He is only the mayor's assistant and cannot handle this.'

Third, the availability of the rhetorical interpretation is associated with the semantics of the attitude verb *yǐwéi*. If *yǐwéi* in (1) is replaced with *rènwéi*, the rhetorical use becomes unavailable, as shown in (3). Unlike *rènwéi*, which simply describes someone's belief, *yǐwéi* carries the presupposition of a false belief, i.e., the speaker views the attitude holder's belief as incorrect (Glass 2022).

- (3) Nǐ rènwéi Lǐbái shì shéi? #Tā zhǐ shì shìzhǎng zhùlǐ, chù-lǐ bù-liǎo zhè shì.
you think Libai be who he only be mayor assistant handle not this thing
'Who do you think Libai is? He is only the mayor's assistant and cannot handle this.'

This study argues that RhQs are questions whose answers are not fully ignorant. In particular, we propose that the ignorance condition of a copular question can change when (a) the *wh*-expression denotes intensional alternatives, and (b) the speaker explicitly indicates that the addressee holds a wrong belief. More concretely, in a copular sentence, only the object can be interpreted intensionally (Percus 2003; Cumming 2008). Hence, the *wh*-expression in (1), but not the one in (2), denotes a set of individual concepts ordered by social ranking (i.e., definite descriptions like *the mayor* (>) *the mayor's secretary* (>) ... (>) *the mayor's driver*). The meaning of the question in (1) is conventionally a set of possible answers like (4). *Yǐwéi* signals that the embedded proposition in each possible answer is false. Given that the speaker notices that the addressee treated Libai as if his status were higher than

the mayor's assistant, ① and ② in (4) are more likely than ③ to be the answer to the question. This introduces a bias towards certain possible answers, deviating from the ignorance condition of a standard question, yielding the rhetorical use (Rohde 2006).

- (4) { ① the addressee YIWEI Libai is the mayor, ② the addressee YIWEI Libai is the mayor's secretary, ③ the addressee YIWEI Libai is the mayor's driver, ... }

再論量詞的語義：數詞說和名詞說

李旭平

浙江大學文學院

電子信箱：xupingli@zju.edu.cn

以漢語等東亞語言為代表的量詞型語言，數量短語中量詞的強制使用使得印歐語中數詞和名詞的常規語義組構規則受到了挑戰。學界就「數量名」的語義組構問題，提出了量詞究竟是被數詞還是被名詞所需要的疑問（Bale and Coon 2014）。量詞的語義有兩種主流分析。大部分西方學者認為量詞具有「個體化（individuation）」功能，而國內學者則普遍認為量詞有“度量（measure）”功能，這正是“數量詞”這一術語的直接來源。事實上，前者認為，量詞是為名詞所需要，而後者則承認量詞是被數詞所需要；它們所對應的結構分別為[數[量-名]]和[數-量[名]]。

我們認為，這兩種觀點事實上並不矛盾。既然這兩個語義功能體現了量詞被不同的句法成分所需要，它們有可能同時在同一數量短語內部都得到實現。本文利用壯語的實例來論證以上可能性。東蘭壯語除了常規的「數量名」短語以外，還有雙量詞短語「數量 1 量 2 名」，分別如 (1a) 和 (1b) 所示。

1. 兩個學生

a. θo:ŋ¹ pu² 兩 量詞人 學生
 b. θo:ŋ¹ pu⁴ tu² 兩 量詞人 量詞有牛 學生

就雙量詞短語而言，任何量詞詞類均能出現在量詞 1 的位置，而量詞 2 隻能由個體量詞充當。我們提出，雙量詞短語的結構成分關係應為“[數量 1][量 2 名]”，其中量詞 1 是數量詞，表示度量功能，而量詞 2 為“名量詞”，起到表示名詞可數性的作用。

本研究的其中一個理論意義在於，我們用民族語的語料證實了 Cheng & Sybesma (1998) 提出的量詞型語言的名詞可以有可數/不可數這一語法對立的可能性。但是，不同於 Cheng & Sybesma 二人的分析，我們認為，(一) 起到區分名詞可數性的不是數量詞，而是出於較低句法位置的名量詞；(二) 名量詞起到了在句法上「構造 (make) 」可數名詞的作用，而不是「標識 (mark) 」名詞的可數性，因此名詞的可數性不實現在詞彙層面，而屬於句法層面 (grammatical countability) 。

關於語義形式化的問題

李宇明

北京語言大學

電子信箱：p55066@blcu.edu.cn

語義是語言形式所表達的意義，是客觀世界和人類社會的語言投射。語言研究的任務之一，就是尋求語言形式與語義之間的對應關係；而對語義研究的水準，又常常表現為語義形式化的程度。

句法樹形圖、數理邏輯式、平行變換、添加、刪減、替代、語義轄域、語義指向、義素分析等，都是語言學將語義形式化的手段。這些手段，或是用符號、圖形來顯現語義；或是用變換、增減成分等方法（其實也是用同義句子等）來辨析語義；或是用一定的方法來說明語義。發明語義形式化的技術，弄清某種手段的語義形式化的能量及適用條件，將不同範疇、不同深度的語義進行形式化，都能帶來巨大的語言學效益，推進語言分析方法、描寫方法的進步。

漢語類指成分的庫藏地位及其句法後果

劉丹青

深圳大學人文學院 / 中國社會科學院語言研究所

電子信箱：liudq@cass.org.cn

光桿單數名詞在許多印歐語中不能單做論元，催生出諸多理論，最重要的是 DP 假說。據此，當光桿 NP 充當論元時，通常被假設存在一個隱性限定詞 D 或經歷了從 N 到 D 的移位。Carlson (1977) 則在語義方面，將英語光桿複數式認定為類指成分，Chierchia (1998) 發展了 Carlson 的理論，對不同語言類型的光桿 NP 給出不同的定性，漢語光桿名詞被認定為名詞性/論元性的，要成為可數個體則須加個體量詞。Cheng & Sybesma (C&S1999) 用名詞到量詞移位解釋漢語光桿名詞的論元功能，認為量詞是 DP 的核心。功能-類型學者 Rijkhoff (2002) 基於語種樣本庫對名詞性短語的類型做了比較分類，認為漢語等量詞語言的名詞屬於類別名詞 (sort nouns)。

本文在庫藏類型學框架下，考察漢語的光桿 NP 和類指現象的句法語義，討論類指成分的句法表現，認為漢語屬於類指優先語言，以類指為元指稱，同時發揮以類指成分表個體的功能，優先使用光桿類指成分。論文概括了類指優先語言的句法特點及其句法後果，兼及類指表達的方言差異，並據此質疑 DP 的普遍性。

Wilkinson 和 Chierchia 都注意到英語中由種類義名詞引導的類指成分在一定句式中可以表達無定個體指稱，如 *That kind of book is on the shelf*。此事重要。

劉丹青 (2002) 指出，類指成分是抑制外延、凸顯內涵的指稱成分。漢語類指的基本形式是光桿 NP。光桿 NP 都可以添加類指量詞同位語而不改變所指（熊貓這種動物吃竹子）。在主語位置，類指未被凸顯的外延是全量或自由選擇 (any; 自由選擇)。類指成分在賓語等被管轄的位置則無法有全量類外延，但仍保留類指功能，可通過類指同位語測試：他吃了榴槤這種東西。

據此，本文評述了關於漢語光桿 NP 和類指成分的若干句法語義學觀點並指出其弱點。包括 Chierchia (1998) 的新 Carlson 主義對英語光桿複數 NP 的類指性的認定、Rijkhoff (2002) 關於英語名詞是單體名詞 (singular object nouns) 的認定、C&S (1999) 認為漢語光桿名詞不那麼光桿，經歷 N 到 C 的移位的觀點。

本文描寫了漢語類指成分的主要句法分佈。在主語位置，主語位置的類指身份較容易確定，有隱性的全量類外延做參照。但有些光桿主語如用英語翻譯，易被理解為有定或無定個體，實際上在漢語中是作為類指成分出現的，凸顯內涵而抑制外延，即使是用於事件謂語動詞後並處於現實式情態，仍可以通過類指同位語測試，如“他吃了蘋果這種東西”，但一旦加

上指稱成分，就不允許類指同位語同現，如“*他吃了一個蘋果這種東西”。文章論證光杆名詞即使在主語賓語位置分別獲得的有定和無定解讀，也是語序、謂語類型、時體情態及語用推理諸因素綜合的結果，可以在語篇中取消，恢復其類指屬性。

類指優先的句法類型特點除了表現在在主賓語位置廣泛使用光杆 NP，而且產生了一系列句法後果，從很多方面塑造了漢語語法的面貌。

1、光杆 NP 大量充當論元，都帶類指屬性，不必用個體性指稱來解釋。

1) 很多賓語實例重在以受事種類表明行為事件的性質，受事個體被抑制，雖然在語境中或可推導出多種個體指稱義，但這些個體指稱義都不在當前的關注中。如：洗衣服 | 殺雞 | 要給女朋友送花 | 只吃了爛麵條。2) 光杆 NP 表示工具、方式、材料等，做動詞或介詞的賓語，其個體指稱不重要：伸出手接過煙去 | 捉了蒼蠅喂螞蟥 | 放下鞭子，解下腰帶來拂打了身上的塵土 | 照照鏡子看看自己吧！3) 結果賓語凸顯行為目的而不關注個體：揉饅頭 | 炒魚香肉絲 | 鉸鞋樣兒 | 擦蘿蔔絲 | 堆雪人 | 孵小雞兒。4) 整體-部分類和整體-屬性類話題結構（主謂謂語句）雖然以小主語有定為規約語義，但一般表現為光杆 NP，個體性被抑制：大象鼻子長 | 這棵樹花小葉子大 | 他脾氣很壞。5) 比較句比喻句的基準、喻體都取類指義：小臉盆大 | 兩盞葫蘆瓢一般大的電燈 | 比火車安全 | 像鮮花一樣美麗。6) 主賓語或事件雙方使用同一光杆 NP，強調事件發生在同類之間：學生打學生 | 熟人專坑熟人。7) 在論元否定句的各種表達方式中，以光杆類指賓語式為最基本的句式：他不喝烈性酒 | 我沒吃蘋果。

2、離合詞豐富活躍。

漢語大量存在離合動詞，最經濟地滿足了漢語對類指論元的偏好。

3、非受事實語（旁格賓語）種類豐富，這類賓語主要為光杆類指 NP，很難個體化。

4、類指成分話題化功能強大，按構式計算，類指性話題比有定性話題的更多（劉丹青 2023）：上位-下位語域式話題：水果，荔枝最好吃 | 整體-部分語域式話題：大象鼻子長。| 動詞性語域式次話題：他學習認真。| 分裂式主話題句：襯衫我買了三件。| 同一性話題：糧食，糧食不夠了，藥品，藥品用完了。

類指優先屬性的具體表現，在漢語中存在方言差異。

以上描述的類指優先、光杆 NP 活躍的類型特點，大體上反映了漢語各方言的總體狀況，但是並不能代表漢語方言的全部。粵語、吳語等量詞顯赫型方言，在類指表徵上與普通話存在重要差異，其中吳語浙北一帶還出現了類指入庫並顯赫的方言（劉丹青 2020）。

在蘇州話等吳方言中，「量名」組合普遍具有有定功能，包括在沒有句法定位的會話獨詞句中，實現了定指範疇的入庫，“量名”組合和光杆名詞構成個體指和類指的對立。粵語情況類似而定指的語法化程度更高。特定的量詞還在吳語和粵語中發展出了類指的用法（劉丹青 2002），包括吳語來自單數個體量詞的“個”（整體類指）、“只”（次類指）和粵語的複數量詞“啲”（整體類指）和“只”（次類指）。

在浙北海鹽話、長興話等及蘇南吳江話中，發展出了高頻使用的類指標記，海鹽的“告”、長興和吳江的“刮”、諸暨的“種”（劉丹青 2020）。詞源上，海鹽的「告」和長興、吳江的「刮」都來自指示詞“個”和種類量詞的合音（=這種）， “種”則直接來自種類量詞的定指用法，由次類指發展出整體類指，形成類指準冠詞，類指罕見地入庫且顯赫。與光杆 NP 的元指稱類指相比，這類加標記的類指可以被視為次生類指。

小結：光杆名詞是最原生態的名詞，是名詞的詞庫形式，只能與外部世界的類對應，因此不帶任何個體標記的光杆名詞才是類指的原生形式，數範疇和定指顯赫則當為後起的現象，光桿 NP 的功能空間被壓縮，讓類指反須藉助個體指手段來表達，從而催生 DP 理論所依託的語言類型現象。但對於定指語法化程度還很低的語言，類指以元指稱身份在名詞語表達中據主導地位，要假設這類語言所有的名詞語都有一個層次複雜的表個體指的 DP 結構，可能既不符合語言的本來面貌，也不符合語言理論的經濟性追求。

“都”：從甚至到總括

劉明明

清華大學外文系

電子郵件：markliu@scarletmail.rutgers.edu

“都”歷來是漢語研究的熱點。當前學界的一個共識是，“都”，至少在“總括”用法下，表全稱量化或分配（王還，1983; Lee，1986; Lin，1998 等）。蔣嚴（1998）、潘海華（2006）、蔣靜忠、潘海華（2013）等進一步提出，全稱量化可以推廣至“都”的其他用法，從而得出對“都”的統一分析。

本次報告著重探討將“都”統一處理為全稱量化所帶來的三個問題。

首先，全稱量化不能正確刻畫“都”的“甚至”用法。以（1）為例，根據語境資訊，只有張三跳過了小溪；按照全稱量化，（1a）應該為假，而這並不符合我們的語感。（1a）和（1b）的對比進一步說明瞭這一點：（1b）用“（連-）也”不好，說明“也”在表“甚至”時仍傳遞追加義，該追加義在當前語境無法滿足，因此（1b）不自然；而與之相似的（1a）自然，說明“甚至-都”連存在性的追加義也沒有，更不用說全稱義了。

（1）[語境：小朋友去徒步旅行，路過一條小溪，小朋友都不敢跳。突然，平時最膽小的張三縱身一躍，跳了過去。老師鼓勵大家，說：]

- a. 快跳吧，（連）張三都跳過去了。
- b. #快跳吧，（連）張三也跳過去了。

即使是直觀上表達全稱量化的含“甚至-都”的句子，我們認為其全稱量化義也並非直接來源於“都”。例如，雖然（2a）中的“連-都”句在直觀上等價於相應的（“所有”）全稱量化句，但如（2b）所示，只有後者能允准排除性“除了”。如果我們認為排除性“除了”的作用是將與之結合的元素從句子的全稱量化範圍中剔除出去（von Stechow，1993），那麼（2b）中“甚至-都”不能允准排除性“除了”，說明該句中並沒有真正的全稱量化成分。根據 Veloudis（1998），我們進一步認為，“甚至-都”表達的全量義是推理的結果，是語用義。

（2）a. 李四連最難的題都會做。≈ 李四所有題都會做。

b. ??除了第四題，李四連最難的題都會做。≠ 除了第四題，李四所有題都會做。

其次，跟“都”搭配的成分多種多樣，表現各不相同，“都”的統一全稱量化說很難處理這種量化多樣性。例如，複數定指性成分和「都」搭配時，中間還可以插入別的量化性成分，如（3a）中的否定詞；但同樣的量化性成分卻不能出現在“所有、每”及任指性疑問代詞和“都”之間（如（3b）所示）。這說明雖然這些“都”字句都表達全稱量化，但全稱量化引入的位置

似乎不同，因此會跟句中其他量化成分產生不同的互動（Liu，2021），而這進一步表明並非是“都”統一引入全稱量化。

(3) {這些學生/所有學生/每個學生/誰}都喜歡金庸。

a. 這些學生不都喜歡金庸。

(插入量化成分)

b. *{每個學生/所有學生/誰}不都喜歡金庸。

vs. 不是{每個學生/所有學生/誰}都喜歡金庸。

又如，“和”跟“或者”均可以跟“都”搭配併產生類似全稱量化的解讀，如呂叔湘（1979：67）觀察到的“動詞或者形容詞都可以做謂語，把或者換成和，不改變全句的意思”。但“或者-都”與“和-都”有個很重要的不同，前者對動詞短語有諸多限制（Xiang，2020），如（4）所示。這一不同說明“或者-都”與“和-都”雖然都可以表示全稱量化，但全稱量化的來源並不相同，不能簡單地說兩者中全稱量化的來源均是“都”。

(4) a. 小王和小李他都{請了/沒請/可以請/必須請}。

b. 小王或者小李他都{*請了/? ? 沒請/可以請/*必須請}。（對動詞短語有限制）

最後，全稱量化是真值條件義的一部分，將「都」看成是全稱量化即便能刻畫「都」字句的語義，也無法刻畫其語用；而劉明明（2023）指出，即使是最簡單的“都”字句對語境也有要求，其語用義不可忽視。請對比（5）中的兩句話，此處的“笑”是一個本身就只有分配解讀的動詞，從“張三和李四笑了”我們必然能得出張三笑了且李四笑了，所以，如果（5b）中的“都”表示全稱量化且對{張三，李四}進行量化，那麼（5a）和（5b）應該表達完全一樣的意思。劉文指出這一結論並不能令人完全滿意：作為母語者，我們仍然會覺得（5）中的兩個句子根據“都”的有無在意義上有不同之處。劉文進一步指出，兩者的不同恰恰在於語用，具體體現為兩句通常被用來回答不同的問題。例如，如果問題是「張三和李四誰笑了？“，那麼如（6a）所示必須用加“都”的（5b）；而如果問題是「哪兩個人笑了？“，則不能加“都”，如（6b）所示。

(5) a. 張三和李四笑了。 b. 張三和李四都笑了。

(6) a. 問：張三和李四誰笑了？ 答：張三和李四#（都）笑了。

b. 問：哪兩個人笑了？ 答：張三和李四（#都）笑了。

我們進而展示從“甚至”出發分析“總括”可以避免上述問題，讓我們對“都”有更準確的認識。根據該分析，“都”預設其所在的句子比語境中相關命題都強，不同用法的“都”實際上是以不同方式來衡量句子間的強度：“甚至-都”對應可能性，而“總括-都”對應邏輯蘊涵（Liao，

2011;Liu, 2017、2021)。同時，我們指出，這種分析實際上是對徐烈炯(2014)的進一步發展，而且刻畫了前人普遍認為的“都₁”表“總括”的直觀：如果我們把(7)中的命題集C看成是一個問題，且把當前句子回答的問題看作是句子的話題(Roberts, 2012)，那麼蘊涵C中的所有命題其實就相當於總括當前的話題。

(7) [s ... 都 C...] 斷言：S

預設：S比相關選項集C中所有命題都強。(強度為蘊涵或可能性)

我們將展示(7)的優勢。首先，“都”沒有增加斷言義，因此可以避免統一全稱量化說下“甚至-都”語義過強的問題，正確刻畫“都”的“甚至”義。其次，因為“都”沒有貢獻真值條件義，不是全稱量化的來源，所以可以跟各種全稱量化搭配，解決量化多樣性的問題。最後，“都”的預設恰恰反映了其對語境的要求，從而可以解釋“都”的語用，並通過“預設最大化”解釋“都”在某些條件下的強制出現(Liu, 2021)。

最後，如果時間允許，我們將給出跨語言證據支援不同用法的“都”應作統一分析，印證從“甚至”到“總括”進行分析的必要性。我們也將討論文獻中一些反對將“都”統一處理的觀點，如周韜(2019)。

複數分裂 (Plurality Split) 與人稱代詞複數的類型

劉星

華中科技大學

電子郵箱：liuxing423abc@163.com

摘要：本文在新描寫主義精神的指導下，從複數語義和代詞語義兩個角度對贛語宜春話中的兩個代詞後的複數標記進行細顆粒度描寫，並且運用複數分裂理論對其語義進行了分析。

贛語宜春話人稱代詞複數有「俚」和「幾個」兩種，根據盛益民（2013）的分類，宜春話中的「俚」與長江中下游地區諸多方言中的複數標記一樣，來自於家義處所詞；「幾個」則來源於數量短語。「俚」只能用在人稱代詞後；「幾個」和普通話「們」類似，既可以用在人稱代詞後，又能夠用在表人普通名詞、親屬稱謂詞和專有名詞等後，例如：

- | | | |
|------------|------|------|
| (1) a. 我俚 | 你俚 | 渠俚 |
| b. *同學俚 | *老師俚 | *桌子俚 |
| (2) a. 我幾個 | 你幾個 | 渠幾個 |
| b. 同學幾個 | 爸爸幾個 | 傑佢幾個 |

這兩個複數標記還能共現，出現「代詞+俚+幾個」結構，但是共現時遵循一定的線性順序。如例（3）和（4）所示，「俚」只能位於「幾個」之前，「幾個」總是處於週邊。

- | | | |
|-----------|-------|-------|
| (3) 我俚幾個 | 你俚幾個 | 渠俚幾個 |
| (4) *我幾個俚 | *你幾個俚 | *渠幾個俚 |

儘管這兩類複數標記都能置於代詞之後表達複數，但是依然存在差異。否則不會出現“我俚幾個”這樣的雙重複數標記，也不會有“*我幾個俚”這種共現限制。本文將通過代詞型複數標記「幾個」和「俚」的對比，考察二者的性質。具體來說回答三個問題：1）同樣表達代詞複數意義，「人稱代詞+俚」和「人稱代詞+幾個」的異同是什麼？在「人稱代詞+俚+幾個」兩個複數標記共現的情況下，作用分別是什麼？2）兩個複數標記共現時「俚」為何總是要在「幾個」之前出現？呈現出“X 俚幾個”的線性關係。3）從複數分裂（Plurality Split）的角度看，不同類型的代詞複數如何刻畫，造成複數類型差異的參數是什麼？

從複數角度，文章從“人稱代詞+俚/幾個”在“真性/連類複數”、“量化（numeration）”、“內聚性（cohesion）”、“分配性”、“強弱指稱（strong-weak referential）”特徵上進行了描寫，從代詞的角度，對“人稱代詞+俚/幾個”指稱性強弱進行了考察。二者的異同有以下五條：

1）“俚”只能標記代詞，“幾個”既能標記代詞也能標記普通表人名詞。2）“代詞+俚”和“代詞+幾個”都不能被數量短語或者其他量化詞修飾。3）“代詞+俚”與混合性謂詞組合有集合和分配兩種解讀；代詞+幾個“只有集合解讀。因此前者複數成員的內聚性低於後者。4）一般情況下，宜春話中的“俚”和“幾個”都具有複數的排除性解讀（強指稱），只能指稱大於一的集

合，不包括單數原子集合。5) 宜春話中的“人稱代詞+俚”具有[+論元，+謂詞]的特徵，屬於 ϕP 型代詞複數，“人稱代詞+幾個”具有[+論元，-謂詞]的特徵，屬於 DP 型代詞複數。因此，後者的有定性強於前者。

從複數分裂的角度，我們認為，複數標記“俚”的語義是最大化算子，最大化算子應用在加合算子之後，因此具有複數意義。而「幾個」的語義是群體算子 (group operator)，作用於“加合算子+最大化算子”之後，將語境中挑選出的最大的複數個體集合再次打包成一個原子個體。這既可以解釋“人稱代詞+俚”和“人稱代詞+幾個”的共性，也能解釋二者的差異。決定複數不同類型的是內聚性參數，即集合中的複數個體是由“例-類” (token-type) 關係聚合在一起，還是由“整體-部分” (part-whole) 關係聚合在一起。

關鍵詞：人稱代詞; 複數; 複數分裂; 贛語

作為顯義的本義 Literal Meaning as Explicatures

蔣嚴

倫敦大學亞非學院

電子郵件：yj9@soas.ac.uk

作為邏輯式的句子組合義（簡稱 LF 語義）具有語義待定性（semantic underdeterminacy），而句子的字面義 literal meaning（本義）則應該具有語義完備性（perfect meaning）。從 LF 語義到字面義的確定，是一個認知推理語用過程，需要從語義-語用介面去認識。縱觀推理語用學的文獻，多數論著在劃分了本義和非本義區別之後，著重探討後者的達成，而關聯理論下的顯義理論則對本義的達成有所論述，認為 LF 語義的擴展可以得到顯義，因為顯義具有語義完備性，所以它可以被視為句子的本義。但是這麼說還是不確，因為其實有兩種顯義，一種是基層顯義，這才相當於擴展的 LF 義，而更另外還有高階顯義，它體現了相關語句（utterance）的命題態度，具有言語行為的特徵。這進一步與斷言（assertion）、言說（saying）、直陳義（what is said）、言者意圖和言者信念等概念相聯繫。顯義不同於含義，它既然是 LF 義的擴展，就必定有與 LF 有邏輯上的關係，也與句子有形式上的特徵，也就是說，顯義是可以做形式化刻畫的。

Jiang (2013) 首次提出了顯義的兩條形式化定義，一是衍推定義，二是包含定義：

- (1) Given a set of propositions \mathcal{S} and a sentence with the logical form representation LF , \mathcal{S} is an explicature set developed from LF if and only if for any P_i , $P_i \in \mathcal{S}$, P_i both entails and contains LF .
- (2) Containment.
A contains B if and only if all the symbols that appear in B or their variable or hyponymic instantiations also appear in A.

現在我們對上述定義略作調整，提出衍推定義是語義定義，而包含定義是形式-詞彙定義（formal lexical definition），它們構成了顯義的兩個方面。

對顯義的形式化定義與對句子命題義都用到了衍推關係，可以揭示命題義與顯義的相通之處。在此我們討論衍推

對顯義的形式化定義涵蓋了著名的 Stanley (2000) 的索引論假設，即對句義的擴展必須遵循顯在或隱含的索引詞所提供的線索，不能隨意擴展。

對顯義的衍推定義也包含了對語義組合關係的繼承。鑒於語義組合是循著語法規則進行的，所以顯義定義其實不會偏離語法規則的約束。

Jiang (2013) 已經說明，相對於一個 LF 語義而顯謂的是一個顯義集合，儘管就具體交際場合而言，並不需要達成超過一個的顯義。該文還討論了上述定義下的顯義與其他一些概念的區別，如預設、含義 (implicatures)、闡釋 (paraphrases) 等。通過上述操作得出的語句的本義，只是陳述性語句的本義，而且是相當於基礎顯義的本義，不能涵蓋非陳述語句的本義，也不能涵蓋高階顯義，因為後兩種語義都無法與 LF 組合義建立衍推關係。

工作書目：

- Börjesson, Kristin. 2014. *The Semantics-Pragmatics Controversy*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Carston, Robyn. (2004) *Explicature and semantics*. In S. Davis and B. Gillon (eds) *Semantics: A Reader*, 817–845. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carston, Robyn. 2010. *Explicit Communication and ‘Free’ Pragmatic Enrichment*. In Soria, Belén. and Romero, Esther. (eds) *Explicit Communication: Robyn Carston's Pragmatics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Israel, Michael.: 2002, *Literally Speaking*, *Journal of Pragmatics* 34.
- Jary, Mark. 2011. *Assertion*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Jary, Mark. 2022. *Nothing Is Said: Utterance and Interpretation*. OUP.
- Jiang, Yan. 2014. *A Formal Characterization of Explicature and its Consequences to Explicating in Chinese*. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, Vol. 8.2. 241-253, Equinox.
- Jodłowiec, Maria. 2015. *The Challenges of Explicit and Implicit Communication: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach*.
- Recanati, François. 2009, *Literal Meaning*. CUP.
- Soria, B. and E. Romero (eds.)2010. *Explicit Communication: Robyn Carston's Pragmatics* (Palgrave Studies in Pragmatics, Language and Cognition).
- Stanley, Jason. 2000 *Context and logical form*. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23: 391–434.

Donkey Sentences in Chinese: In Defense of the Null Hypothesis

Haihua PAN

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Email: panhaihua@cuhk.edu.hk

Hang KUANG

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Cheng and Huang's (1996) pioneering work on donkey anaphora in Chinese claims that *wh*-expressions and pronouns have a complimentary distribution in the consequent clause of Chinese donkey conditionals: bare conditionals only allow *wh*-phrases (1a), whereas *ruguo/dou* conditionals only permit pronouns (and definite descriptions) (1b and 1c). They propose a construction-specific and phrase-specific interpretation: the unselective binding mechanism of classic DRT applies to bare conditionals, in which *wh*-phrases occurring in pairs are always bound variables (2a); anaphoric pronouns in *ruguo/dou* conditionals always function as E-type pronouns (2b). However, Pan and Jiang (2015) challenge Cheng and Huang's analysis by presenting substantial evidence against the alleged complementary distribution of anaphoric expressions in different types of conditionals. They further argue that, under appropriate contexts, the E-type strategy can be employed for anaphoric *wh*-phrases, and anaphoric pronouns can also function as bound variables. We take Pan and Jiang's proposal as the null hypothesis concerning the interpretation of anaphoric expressions in Chinese donkey sentences.

- (1) a. Shei xian lai, **shei** xian chi.
 who first come who first eat
 'Whoever comes first eats first.'
- b. Ruguo ni kanjian shei, jiao **ta** lai jian wo.
 if you see who ask he come see me
 'If you see someone, ask him to come see me.'
- c. Ni jiao shei jinlai, wo dou jian **ta**.
 you ask who enter I all see him
 'Whoever you ask to come in, I'll see him.'
- (2) a. NECX [... *x*...] [... *x*...]
- b. $\exists x$ [... *x*...] \rightarrow [... E-type...]

In this work, we examine in detail Cheng and Huang's (2020) recent responses and demonstrate that their attempts to defend their original theory are untenable, thereby supporting Pan and Jiang's null hypothesis. Cheng and Huang (2020) address the problematic data for their 1996 framework by recasting the distinction between bare conditionals and *ruguo/dou* conditionals as a new dichotomy between *wh-wh* conditionals and *wh*-pronoun conditionals, thus maintaining that anaphoric *wh*-phrases must be bound variables and anaphoric pronouns always serve as E-type pronouns. We show that many counter-examples are accounted for in their revised theory in an ad hoc manner, and that the new dichotomy is essentially a stipulation lacking empirical support. We demonstrate that regardless of their types, Chinese donkey conditionals allow either a *wh*-phrase or an anaphoric pronoun as the anaphoric element, although certain conditional types may have a preferred option. Crucially, conditionals with either anaphoric *wh*-phrases or pronouns are ambiguous between a definite/referential reading and a generic/quantificational reading, which argues against a fixed interpretation for anaphoric *wh*-phrases and pronouns. Furthermore, we contend that *dou*-conditionals

allow pairs of *wh*-phrases to be unselectively bound by *dou* ‘all’ (3), resulting in the interpretation ‘for all *x*, if you let *x* see it, *x* will say I meant well.’ This is a genuine interpretation of (3), rather than an inference, contra Cheng and Huang’s view.

- (3) Gei shei kan, shei dou hui shuo wo shi haoxinhaoyi.
give who see who all hui say I be good-will
‘Whoever you give it to see, he will say I meant well.’

Selected references

- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen, and C.-T. James Huang. 1996. Two types of donkey sentences. *Natural Language Semantics*, 4, 121-163.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen, and C.-T. James Huang. 2020. Revisiting donkey anaphora in Mandarin Chinese: A reply to Pan and Jiang (2015). *International Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 7(2), 167-186.
- Pan, Haihua, and Yan Jiang. 2015. The bound variable hierarchy and donkey anaphora in Mandarin Chinese. *International Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 2(2), 159-192.

***Wh*-relatives as *wh*-interrogatives in Mandarin Chinese: Dynamicity, interrogativity and intensionality**

Qianqian Ren

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Email: qianqianren@cuhk.edu.hk

Previously, it has been claimed that Chinese possesses structures parallel to English *wh*-relatives, despite differences in word order and presence of overt *wh*-movement (Aoun & Li, 2003, pp. 182–186; Huang, Li & Li, 2009, pp. 222–227; Ning, 1993, p. 126). The current investigation reexamines the syntactic and semantic nature of so-called *wh*-relatives in Chinese and of the noun phrases containing them. It reveals that what have been recognized as *wh*-relatives in Chinese are in fact *wh*-interrogatives (at least for the case of Mandarin Chinese, MC henceforth) and the whole noun phrases denote individual concepts instead of individuals. These claims are supported by diagnoses for interrogative clauses and results of corpus analyses concerning distributions of such noun phrases. For example, so-called *wh*-relatives in MC can tolerate multiple *wh*-items, reminiscent of multiple *wh*-questions, are compatible with interrogative intensifiers *dàodǐ* ‘on earth’ and *jiǔjìng* ‘exactly’ (Lv, 1980, p. 153, p. 314), and can be led the cause-pursuing *zěnmé* ‘how come,’ which is analyzed as an interrogative complementizer (Stepanov & Tsai, 2008; Tsai, 2008). These behaviors strongly suggest that the *wh*-clause should be analyzed as a *wh*-interrogative. Furthermore, corpus analyses showed that noun phrases containing so-called *wh*-relatives were far more likely to occur as complement to rogative and responsive verbs compared to noun phrases containing non-*wh*-relatives, and while the latter were attested in extensional contexts, the former were not (The Beijing Language and Culture University Corpus Center (BLCU Corpus Center, BCC) Corpus: <http://bcc.blcu.edu.cn>). These findings suggest that noun phrases containing so-called *wh*-relatives in MC are individual concepts, thus often used as concealed questions (Heim, 1979; Romero, 2005). It is proposed, then, such noun phrases should be analyzed as individual concepts embedding a *wh*-interrogative (WH-ICs for short).

The claim that the concerned noun phrase structures in fact embed interrogatives and the need to combine the *wh*-clause and the head noun are however at odds with the mainstream semantic analysis of questions—the propositional approach (Hamblin, 1973; Karttunen, 1977; Theiler et al., 2018). Under this approach, the *wh*-phrase is analyzed as an existential quantifier phrase. Thus, the *wh*-phrase in a WH-IC needs to be “re-opened” to be accessible to the head noun, as the two are required to match (e.g., *shíjiān* ‘time’/*rìqī* ‘date’ for a temporal *wh*-phrase, *fāngfǎ/bànfǎ* ‘method’ for *zěnmeyàng* ‘how’ and *yuányīn* ‘reason’ for *wèishénme* ‘why,’ etc.). Several different ways to compose WH-ICs are considered, including the categorial/functional/ structured-meaning approach to question semantics, a dynamic approach and an E-type pronoun analysis. To decide among them, it is crucial to study some other properties shown by WH-ICs: First, the more “nominal” the *wh*-item is, the hard it will be for it to occur in WH-ICs; Second, constituency tests show that the *wh*-interrogatives are more like complements rather than adjuncts to the head nouns in WH-ICs. It is proposed then that the restriction against nominal *wh*-types is due to coindexation between the *wh*-item and the head noun, the latter having the whole *wh*-clause in its c-commanding domain, because Binding C effects occur when a nominal *wh*-item gets embedded in a WH-IC construction.

A dynamic analysis is spelled out that models sentences as relations between info-states and info-states as pairs of possible world–assignment function pairs. This way, both informative and inquisitive updates can be captured. The *wh*-phrase in a WH-IC construction introduces a new d-ref, which is picked up later via an index on the head noun.

The Semantics of Accented/Unaccented Variants of Chinese Focus Particles

Yuan Shen
Fudan University
Email: yshen8@fudan.edu.cn

The typical study of focus association in literature involves focus particles which do not carry focus, but just associate with the focus constituent. (1) is a schematic representation of additive particles, exclusive particles, and scalar particles, where F stands for the expression in focus which is typically marked by accent.

- (1) a. [ADD1 [... F1...]]: [... F...] ¹ (F' ≠ F[... F'...])
 b. [EXCL1 [... F1...]]: $\neg \exists F' \neq F[... F'...]$ ([... F...])
 c. [SCAL1 [... F1...]]: [... F...] ($\neg \exists F' \neq F[... F'...] < \text{likely } [... F'...]$)

The fact that focus particles *per se* could be accented has only recently come to the attention of researchers. In this paper, I investigate the accentuation behavior of the Chinese exclusive particle *zhi*, the additive particle *hai*, and the scalar particle *dou* and what accentuation reveals about the semantics of these particles and their uses.

Like *only*, *zhi* is conceived to have a traditional non-scalar use and a scalar use and caught in the controversy as to whether there is only one lexical entry (Klinedinst 2005, Beaver & Clark 2008, Roberts 2011, Coppock & Beaver 2014) or the two uses reflect a lexical ambiguity (Horn 1969). For those who hold a “single entry” view, the difference between the ‘scalar’ and apparently ‘non-scalar’ uses of *only* lies in the nature of the scale: with ‘scalar uses’ *only* operates over a ‘rank order’ scale; with apparently non-scalar uses *only* operates over an ‘entailment-based’ scale. *Only* is inherently a scalar particle in that it imposes an order on the set of alternatives (‘rank’ or ‘entailment’ scale): It presupposes that *p* is the weakest element in the set; it asserts that all alternatives in C stronger than *p* are false. We find evidence against the “single entry” hypothesis: whereas the non-scalar *zhi* can be either accented or unaccented, the scalar *zhi* can never be accented. The accented and unaccented status of *zhi* in general can be accounted for by Question under Discussion and Question-Answer Congruity. The unique accentuation behavior of the scalar *zhi* is due to the fact that it can never be at-issue information as diagnostic tests would show.

Hai in its accented and unaccented variant can be compared to the additive particle *also* and the (additive-)scalar particle *even* respectively. Classical claim (e.g. Rooth 1985, 1992) holds that *even* ($[[\text{even}]] \text{ g,c} = \lambda C. \lambda p. \lambda w. \exists q \text{ q} \neq p \wedge q(w) = 1 \wedge \forall q \in C \text{ q} \neq p \rightarrow p >_{\text{unlikely}} q. p(w) = 1$) is just like *also* in terms of additivity: at least one distinct alternative in C is true in *w* (Horn 1969, Karttunen & Peters 1979, Rooth 1985, 1992). The present study raises doubts about the presence of the additive presupposition: the scalar use of *hai* may or may not have additive presupposition. In neither case can the scalar use of *hai* be accented. Diagnostic tests show how the scalar use of *hai* behaves differently from the non-scalar use of *hai* in cases with and without additive presupposition.

Like the scalar uses of *zhi* and *hai*, the scalar particle *dou* is always unaccented. The study shows that only at-issue information could be accented and that scalar particles/uses convey not-at-issue information only and hence should remain unaccented. The at-issue/not-at-issue distinction of focus particles/uses can be clarified further by resorting to the distinction between focus association and alternative evaluation.

Maintaining Mandarin *hen* as a weak intensifier

Yenan Sun

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Email: yenansun@cuhk.edu.hk

Grano & Davis (2018) (see also Grano 2012, Bobaljik 2012) establish a language universal that for a gradable adjective (GA), its comparative form is no more complex than its positive form – it is either derived from its positive form (i.e. French, English) or is identical to it (i.e. Japanese). Crucially, they argue that the positive semantics is achieved via POS (a syntactically invisible type-shifting), which is never realized with overt morphology in languages. Mandarin Chinese, however, seems to pose a potential counterexample: a bare gradable adjective can readily give rise to a comparative semantics, but at least in some cases requires an (unstressed) adverb *hen* ‘very’ for the positive reading (1), though not always (2).

(1) 約翰?? (很) 高。 “John is tall” (2) 就約翰高。 “Only JOHN is tall”

This paper maintains G&D's universal by arguing that the unstressed *hen* cannot be the overt counterpart of POS but is a weak intensifier with the semantics in (3) just like English *very* (see also Zhang & Pan 2021).

(3) $[[hen]] = \lambda G(d,et) \lambda x. \exists d[G(d)(x) \wedge d > ! dc]$ where $>!$ is a context-dependent relation ‘greater than by some small amount’ and dc is a contextually determined threshold

Its apparent bleached meaning in (1) is an illusion due to the vague nature of relative GAs: according to Leffel et al (2019), since the standard of “standing out” in height is heavily context-dependent and can never be clear-cut even when one fixes the comparison class and imprecision issues (i.e. Sorites Paradox, see Kennedy 2007), increasing the threshold dc by a small amount, which is what *hen* or English *very* does, fails to significantly strengthen its truth conditions. Their claim is supported with experimental data: when increasing a vague threshold with *very*, participants basically cannot identify individuals that are tall but not very tall under any context.

By contrast, Leffel et al show that when a weak intensifier modifies absolute GAs whose thresholds are not inherently vague (Kennedy & McNally 2005, K&M), the intensifying effect should be more visible and can be differentiated from the unintensified positive semantics of POS. This prediction is born out in Mandarin. For classical absolute GAs such as *wan* ‘curved’ and *kong* ‘empty’ (Liu 2017, 2018), they exhibit similar constraints w.r.t using bare forms to express positive readings as relative GAs: they sound degraded in a neutral declarative, but improve when focus (or other licensors like negation, interrogative, etc. see Liu 2010, Zhang 2021) are added:

(4) ?? 這條路{彎/空}。 Int: “This road is {curved/empty}”

(5) 就這條路{彎/空}。 “Only THIS road is {curved/empty}”

If *hen* is an overt counterpart of POS (and *hen* is required to occur in (4) for independent reasons in Chinese grammar, see Grano 2012, Zhang and Pan 2022, a.o., which is not our main concern here), we predict that adding *hen* to (4) can result in a standard positive reading for absolute GAs, namely a

minimal/maximal reading. However, this is not true: adding *hen* to (4) indeed makes it acceptable, but the resulted meaning is obligatorily intensified into ‘This room is very {curved/empty}’, which can be distinguished from the truly neutral positive reading expressed by the bare form in (5) as follows. For a minimum GA like *wan* ‘curved’, if we set up a context in which this road possesses a non-zero but extremely small degree of curvedness as in (6), then (5) can be uttered but not (4) with the unstressed *hen*:

(6) Context: *This road is slightly curved; all the other roads are perfectly straight.*

- a. √就這條路彎。 ‘Only THIS road is curved’ (minimal reading)
- b. #這條路很彎。 ‘This road is very curved’ (intensified reading)

Moreover, the denial of (4) entails that the relevant subject possesses a zero degree of curvedness, as shown by the infelicitous follow-up in (6a); by contrast, the denial of the form marked by *hen* is compatible with the road having some degree of curvedness (6b):

- (7) a. 就這條路不彎，#雖然我能看見一點曲度。
‘This road is not curved, #though I can see some curvedness’
- b. 這條路不是很彎，雖然我能看見一點曲度。
‘This road is not very curved, though I can see some curvedness’

The pattern in (6-7) would be fully expected if *hen* is a weak intensifier like English *very*, which increases the threshold from the lower bound of the scale to a higher degree. For a maximum GA like *kong* ‘empty’, adding *hen* also fails to yield the canonical maximal reading. K&M point out that while *an empty restaurant* is typically used to describe a restaurant with no diners, *a very empty restaurant* strongly implies that the restaurant is not empty, but just with a few diners. This ‘anti-maximal reading’ effect is exactly observed with Mandarin *hen*:

(8) *This restaurant has no diners. All the others have a very low amount of diners from 2 to 5.*

- a. √就這家餐廳空。 ‘Only THIS restaurant is empty’ (maximal reading)
- b. #這家餐廳很空。 ‘This restaurant is very empty’ (‘anti-maximal reading’ effect)

Selected references. Grano & Davis. 2018. Universal markedness in gradable adjectives revisited. | Leffel et al. 2019. Vagueness in Implicature: The Case of Modified Adjectives. | Chen-Sheng Luther Liu. 2018. Projecting adjectives in Chinese. | Grano 2012. Mandarin *hen* and Universal Markedness in gradable adjectives.

A QUD-based approach to Mandarin *dou*

Cheng-Yu Edwin Tsai
University of Macau
Email: cytsai@um.edu.mo

Issue: This talk begins with the comparison between the deontic modal sentence (1) and *dou*-construction (2): Both express a free choice (FC) interpretation but are not identical. Following Chierchia (2013), the FC interpretation of (1) (i.e., $\Diamond A \wedge \Diamond B$) can be derived by a recursive exhaustification process, where the covert exhaustifier *O* operates on a set of pre-exhaustified alternatives of the disjunction $A \vee B$. By contrast, the FC component of (2) hinges not only on a possibility modal and disjunction, but also on *dou* and left-dislocated disjunction.

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) Ni (*dou) keyi tiao A huo B.
you DOU can pick A or B
'You can pick A or B.' | (2) A huo B, ni *(dou) keyi tiao.
A or B you DOU can pick
'A or B, you can pick (it).' |
|---|--|

Xiang (2020) analyzes *dou* as the special exhaustifier in (3), which presupposes that its prejacent *p* has at least one sub-alt(ernative) in the domain *C*, while asserting *p* and the falsehood of the exhaustification of each sub-alt *q* (i.e., for each *q*, it is not the case that only *q*).

$$(3) \llbracket \text{dou}_C \rrbracket = \lambda p \lambda w: \exists q \in \text{SUB}(p, C). p(w) = 1 \wedge \forall q \in \text{SUB}(p, C) [O_C(q)(w) = 0]$$

This analysis covers many uses of *dou* but leaves open the following puzzles: (i) *A huo B* is outside *dou*'s scope. (ii) Applying (3) to (2) results in the same FC interpretation as in (1); by *Maximize Presupposition!* (Heim 1991), (1) should be blocked by (2) because they contribute the same information but (2) has a stronger presupposition. However, (1) and (2) are both felicitous responses to the question 'What can I pick?'. (iii) When *keyi* 'can' is changed to *bixu* 'must', (1) retains the FC-ness but (2) entails the stronger $\Box A \wedge \Box B$. Xiang however considers such cases ungrammatical and derives the contradiction $\Box O(A) \wedge \Box O(B)$ based on (3) and the assumption that 'must' embeds *O*. (iv) Finally, (3) doesn't explain the contrast of (4) vs. (5), as applying (3) to 'you can only pick A or B' in (5) yields the same FC interpretation as in (4).

- | | |
|---|--|
| (4) Ni <u>zhi</u> keyi tiao A huo B.
you only can pick A or B
'You can only pick A or B.' | (5) * A huo B, ni dou <u>zhi</u> keyi tiao.
A or B you DOU only can pick
Intended: Same as (4) |
|---|--|

Proposal: I argue that (2) is a contrastive topic (CT) construction where *dou* is a functional head marking CT and relating to discourse structure. Specifically: (i) The trace of *dou*'s preja-cent is F-marked; thus (2) has the focus semantic value in (6a), which is the question under discussion (QUD) for (2). (ii) The disjunction is CT-marked; thus (2) has the CT-value in (6b), namely a set of polar subquestions. Assuming the denotation of a polar question '*p*?' is a singleton set $\{p\}$ (Biezma & Rawlins 2012), (6b) is equivalent to (6c). (iii) *Dou* is defined in (6d): It takes a question (*Q*, here (6a)) and a set of polar questions/singleton sets of propositions (*K*, here (6b)) as arguments, presupposes that every member in *K* is entailed by *Q*, and asserts that every member which occurs "somewhere in" (i.e., the special membership relation ' $\ast\in$ ' in Constant 2014) *K* is true; for (2), this means every subquestion in (6b) is positively answered. The entailment relation notated as ' \models ' in (6d) is one between questions (Groenendijk & Stokhof 2011, Roberts 2012): $Q_1 \models Q_2$ iff every proposition that completely answers Q_1 also completely answers Q_2 . Therefore, *dou*'s presupposition amounts to the requirement that the QUD to which the *dou*-construction responds is a superquestion whose complete answer entails the answer to every subquestion in the CT-value denoted by the CT.

- (6) a. $\llbracket(2)\rrbracket^f = \{p \mid \exists x[p = \lambda w[\text{you can pick } x \text{ in } w]]\}$ (QUD; Roberts 2012)
 b. $\llbracket(2)\rrbracket^{ct} = \{\text{'Can you pick A?'}, \text{'Can you pick B?'}\}$ (CT-value; Buring 2003)
 c. $\{\{\text{'You can pick A'}\}, \{\text{'You can pick B'}\}\}$ (equiv. to (6b); Biezma & Rawlins 2012)
 d. $\llbracket dou \rrbracket = \lambda Q_{\langle st, t \rangle} \lambda K_{\langle \langle st, t \rangle, t \rangle} \lambda w: \forall k \in K[Q \models k]. \forall q[q(w) \ast\in K \rightarrow q(w) = 1]$

In the remainder of this talk, I discuss how the definition (6d) addresses the aforementioned puzzles surrounding (1)–(5) and further observations and how (6d) can be minimally modified to account for the scalar *lian...dou* construction, and suggest a new definition of the particle *lian*, which presupposes that its preja-cent is the positive answer to the subquestion that is least likely to be positively answered among all "alternative subquestions".

語氣副詞“實在”的量級語義學分析

王瑩瑩

湖南大學外國語學院

電子郵箱：wangyyhnu@163.com

副詞「實在」通常被看作是語氣副詞或者評注類副詞（李勁榮 2007; 肖奚強 2007; 陳熹 2008; 齊春紅 2008; 張誼生 2000; 齊滬揚 2011 等）。在以往研究中，學者們主要關注兩個問題：一是「實在」與其他表確認的副詞如「的確」、「真的」在用法上有何差異？二是「實在」及所在語句的精確意義是什麼？

對於問題一，學者們主要有兩點發現：一是「的確」和「真的」只能用於確認前文內容（如（1a）），不能用於無背景命題的語篇中（如（1b）），而「實在」不受此限制（參見肖奚強 2007; 王宏 2013; 石定栩 2022 等）；二是「實在」只能用在表程度的語句中，而「的確」和「真的」沒有此限制（如（2），參見李勁榮 2007; 王宏 2013; 石定栩 2022 等）。

（1）語境：張三今天看起來無精打采。

a. 李四：「今天為什麼沒精神？昨天睡得太晚了？你一般不是 10 點就睡了嗎？」

張三：「我昨天的確/真的/實在睡得太晚了。」

b. 李四：「今天為什麼沒精神？」

張三：「我昨天#的確/#真的/實在睡得太晚了。」

（2）張三的確/真的/*實在是個學生。

對於問題二，詞典中一般將「實在」解釋為表強調，強調情況的真實性（侯學超 1998; 呂叔湘 1999; 張斌 2001）。但是，這種解釋不足以區分“實在”與其他表確認義的副詞在意義上的差別。後來的研究者們多從「實在」所在的語句和語篇出發描寫其含義。比如，李勁榮（2007）指出「實在」總是出現在表達因果關係的語境中，且只能用在表程度的語句里，表示主觀上對事物的高程度性狀進行確認；陳熹（2008）認為「實在」句一般含有主觀色彩，強調經人們反覆嘗試而最終確認的思想過程；楊雪梅（2012）進一步細化，認為“實在”有三種意義：表示幾經努力達到極點而不能實現某種預期行為，或強調達到極點，或幾經思考而得到的認識。最近，石定栩（2022）在概括“實在”的語義個性時進行簡化，指出“實在”句中的“實在”就是和當前命題構成一個新命題，使得其內容等級高於當前命題。

問題一的發現目前已基本達成共識。對於問題二，本文更為贊同石文對於“實在”語義貢獻的描述。根據馬真（2004：213），在虛詞分析中應該避免“將虛詞所在的格式的語法意義歸到那虛詞身上”。對比（3a）和（3b），不難發現，（3b）所表達的“累”的程度確實比（3a）高，而這正是因為“實在”在起作用。

（3）a. 我累了。

b. 我實在累了。

現在的問題是：（一）“實在”作為語氣副詞（而非程度副詞），作用於命題（如例（3）中的“我累了”），而非該命題中的等級性謂詞（如“累”），何以提高其相關命題中的程度值？（二）“實在”對表程度的謂詞是否有選擇性？是否所有等級性謂詞都同樣能夠與「實在」搭配？“實在”與非等級性謂語成分的搭配（如搭配否定性能性結構“黑板上的字實在擦不掉”）如何解釋？（三）對於等級性謂詞，強化本可以通過程度副詞來實現，說話者使用“實在”的動因何在？石文對這幾個問題都沒有探討。

鑒於此，本文結合 CCL 語料庫中的實例，基於量級語義學的相關理論研究上述三個問題，結論如下：（1）“實在”可看作是一個全稱量化算子，它操控由其毗鄰命題中包含的量級性謂詞的解釋所觸發的所有可能語境（如“標準值不同的語境”或“精確度不同的語境”），要求該量級性命題在這些語境中都為真，從而產生強化效應。（2）“實在”句中的謂語既可以是等級性的，也可以是非等級性的，但後者要具備一定的量級性特徵。此外，在等級性形容詞中，“實在”多與相對形容詞共現，較少與頂端封閉型的絕對形容詞共現，這與它們的量級結構有關。（3）“實在”的語義解釋模式表明，說話者在使用“實在”時要花費更多認知上的努力，傳達了“幾經努力、反復思考得出的結論”這一直觀意義，區別於一般的程度修飾詞。

How to Obtain Valid Generalized Modal Syllogisms from Valid Generalized Syllogisms

Ran Xia

School of Philosophy, Anhui University, Hefei, China

Email: 327546233@qq.com

Jing Xu

School of Philosophy, Anhui University, Hefei, China

School of Marxism, Anhui Medical University, Hefei, China

Abstract: There are many kinds of syllogisms in natural language, such as Aristotelian syllogisms, generalized syllogisms, Aristotelian modal syllogisms, generalized modal syllogisms, and so on. All the propositions contained in these syllogisms are sentences with quantification which are the largest number of sentences in natural language. Therefore, studying the validity of these syllogisms is one of the important aspects of natural language information processing knowledge reasoning in artificial intelligence. This paper focuses on how to obtain valid generalized modal syllogisms from valid generalized syllogisms.

Making full use of the truth value definitions of sentences with quantification, possible world semantics and/or fuzzy logic, one can prove the validity of generalized modal syllogisms. This paper shows that the proof of the validity of a generalized modal syllogism can be transformed into that of its corresponding generalized syllogism, and that the generalized syllogism obtained by removing all modalities in any valid generalized modal syllogism is still valid. Therefore, the simplest way to screen out valid generalized modal syllogisms is to add modalities to valid generalized syllogisms, and then to delete all invalid syllogisms by means of the basic rules with which valid generalized modal syllogisms should meet. And then the remainders are valid. This paper illustrates how to obtain 12 valid generalized modal syllogisms by adding necessary modalities and/or possible modalities to any valid generalized syllogism. The two kinds of syllogisms discussed in this paper are composed of sentences with quantification which is the largest number of sentences in natural language. Hence, this innovative research can provide theoretical support for linguistics, logic, artificial intelligence, and among other fields.

Keywords: generalized modal syllogisms; generalized syllogisms; validity; truth value definition

Event Definiteness and The Temporal Interpretation of *Shi-de* Clefts in Mandarin Chinese

Xia Xue

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Email: xia_xue@link.cuhk.edu.hk)

Temporal constraints of *shi-de* clefts revisited: Mandarin *shi-de* clefts (specifically *shi-V-de-O* clefts with pre-object *de*), compared to bare *shi-* clefts, are claimed to have more strict temporal constraints: (i) past interpretations seem obligatory, and (ii) aspect markers (e.g., ‘*zai/le/zhe/guo*’), negative markers (e.g., ‘*bu/mei*’) and modals are not allowed in the verbal domain of *shi-de* clefts. Most scholars consider such constraints result from the particle *de* and view *de* as a TAM marker: a past tense marker (Simpson and Wu 2002), or a (perfective) aspect marker with past information (Shi 1984, Paul and Whitman 2008), or a realis mood marker (Liu and Cheng 2021). However, we found that given proper contexts, *shi-de* clefts can be used to describe events that are in the past or present or future of the utterance time, either ongoing or completed at the reference time, and either real or unreal. This provides strong evidence that the function of pre-object *de* is not to express past tense, perfectivity or realis mood. Moreover, pre-object *de* cannot function as an independent TAM marker in sentences other than *shi-de* clefts. In this paper, we re-analyze the ‘obligatory past interpretation’ of *shi-de* clefts as an existential condition on the event in question: the event must have taken place (ongoing or completed) in the situation of evaluation (possibly not the utterance situation or any situation in the real world). Next question is how to explain such condition.

Event definiteness in *shi-de* clefts and in world languages: Previous study (e.g., Shancun 1999) has pointed out that the key function of *shi-de* clefts is to uniquely pick up an event in the common ground and makes some new predications on it. Hole (2011) argued that *de* semantically functions like a definite event determiner but without any event reference: it only introduces familiarity and uniqueness presuppositions of the event. He viewed the exhaustive reading of the focused item as a result of event definiteness, and the past reading of *shi-de* clefts as a default setting ([+anterior, -irrealis]) of the (aboutness) topic structure marked by the copula *shi*. We believe Hole (2011) on the right track that *shi-de* clefts involves event definiteness (and in fact most times are referential to events). We list two types of evidence here: (i) *shi-de* clefts and bare *shi-*clefts are sometimes interchangeable, but when reference to a definite event is required, only *shi-de* clefts are acceptable; (ii) recent research found that event definiteness is marked by the nominal definite determiner in the verbal domain in many world languages, some of which are similar to *shi-de* clefts in meaning and distribution, e.g., Ga (Renans 2016, 2021). Based on language-internal and cross-linguistic observations, we proposed that the covert definite determiner in the nominal domain in Mandarin (Simpson 2005, Wu and Bodomo 2009) appears in the verbal domain of *shi-de* clefts and expresses event definiteness. Contrary to Hole (2011), we further argue that the temporal constraints of *shi-de* clefts are derived from event definiteness instead of the topic structure, while the exhaustiveness of the focused item is derived from *shi*-clefts instead of *de*.

Deriving temporal constraints from event definiteness: Given that *shi-de* clefts involve event definiteness, we can naturally explain the temporal constraints. First, the obligatory past reading of *shi-de* clefts, now revised to an existential condition on the event in question, is itself part of the presuppositions of event definiteness: an event uniquely satisfying the descriptive content should exist (therefore having taken place) in the resource situation introduced by the definite determiner (Renans 2016, 2021, based on Schwarz 2009); the resource situation is usually bound by the topic situation (i.e., the situation of evaluation) of the sentence, but it can also be bound by quantifiers. Secondly, the constraint on TAM markers and related constraints follow from their incompatibility with definite

events: (i) aspect markers (e.g., *le/zhe/guo*) in Mandarin are claimed to associate with the existential closure on events (Lin 2004), thus not compatible with definite events (this can be seen as the ‘definiteness effect’ in the event domain); (ii) modals are operators on events/situations and require a free event variable, which cannot be satisfied in the case of definite events; similarly, habitual readings and individual-level predicates cannot be licensed in *shi-de* clefts as well, since here the Gen operator cannot bind a proper event variable (we adopt the analysis of Chierchia 1995 that individual-level predicates must be bound by a Gen operator in VP); (iii) negative markers are banned simply because they contradict with the existential presupposition of the event.

Parallel between the domain of entities and events: In event semantics, events are viewed as spatiotemporal individuals, parallel to entities (Davidson 1969). The case of event definiteness is one manifestation of the parallel between the entity domain and the event domain. An issue left over is the status of *de* in *shi-de* clefts: if event definiteness comes from a covert definite determiner and focus-related properties are ascribed to *shi*-clefts, what is the function of *de*? Does *de* have a parallel function in nominal and verbal domain? In fact, in the nominal domain, *de*-modifiers can only introduce modifications on bare nouns or referential NPs (*XP+*de*+non-referential NP), that is, only with an individual-denoting NP of type *e* (following the idea that Mandarin bare nouns are of type *e* by Chierchia 1998). In the verbal domain, *shi-de* clefts also introduce modifications on an individual-denoting VP of type *v* (following the idea that arguments introduced by theta-heads are predicate modifications on events just like adjuncts in Neo-Davidsonian event semantics, e.g., Parsons 1990). A preliminary hypothesis of a cross-domain function of *de* is to mark modifications on individuals (of type *e* or *v*). A finer-grained analysis is still awaited in the future.

Selected References

- [1] Hole. D. 2011. The deconstruction of Chinese *shi... de* clefts revisited. *Lingua*. [2] Lin. T. H. J. 2004. Aspect, distributivity and Wh/QP interaction in Chinese. *Language and Linguistics*. [3] Liu. Y. & Cheng. G. 2021. Narrow focus, wide focus and the semantics of Mandarin *de* construction. *Studies of the Chinese Language*. [4] Paul. W. & Whitman. J. 2008. *Shi... de* focus clefts in Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistic Review*. [5] Renans. A. 2016. A cross-categorial definite determiner: evidence from Ga (Kwa). *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)*. [6] Renans. A. 2021. Definite descriptions of events: progressive interpretation in Ga (Kwa). *Linguistics and Philosophy*. [7] Simpson. A. & Wu. Z. 2002. From D to T-Determiner incorporation and the creation of tense. *Journal of east Asian Linguistics*

Mandarin epistemic indefinite *mǒu* at the syntax-semantics interface A presuppositional question-based analysis

Bo Xue

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Email: XUEBo@link.cuhk.edu.hk

Motivation This paper examines the Mandarin prenominal marker *mǒu* from the perspective of the syntax-semantics interface. As shown in (1a), this marker strongly signals an unknown epistemic inference as it is not compatible with a continuation like (1b) providing specificational information about the identity of the boy. Although epistemic/modal indefinites from other languages (e.g. German, English, Spanish, Romanian) have attracted much attention in current semantic theorizing (e.g., Dayal 1997; Farkas 2002; Alonso-Ovalle & Menéndez-Benito 2015), a compositional analysis of Mandarin *mǒu* is still elusive. This paper aims to fill this gap.

- (1) a. Tā zhèngzài gēn gēbì bān mǒu yí gè nánshēng tán-liànnài ne.
she PROG with neighboring class MOU one CL boy date SFP
Lit. ‘She is dating with some boy in the class next door.’
b. Nà gè nánshēng jiù shì Xiǎomíng.
that CL boy JIU COP Xiaoming
Lit. ‘That boy is Xiaoming.’

***Mǒu* as an Epistemic Determiner** Four pieces of evidence, one syntactic and three semantic, establish that *mǒu* is an epistemic indefinite. Syntactically, *mǒu* behaves as a determiner as it competes with Mandarin demonstratives like *nà* ‘that’ (and quantifiers like *suǒyǒu* ‘all’ and *dàduōshuò* ‘most’), which are assumed to occupy a determiner position (Huang, Li & Li 2009). Semantically, there are three tests to diagnose the existential quantificational force of *mǒu*. Like an indefinite expression, *mǒu* doesn’t allow modification of *jīhū* ‘almost’ and when modified by the exception phrase *chúle*, *mǒu* yields an additive reading but not an exceptive reading as a whole. Moreover, *mǒu* can appear in presentational existential constructions and triggers $\exists \wedge \neg \forall$ scalar implicatures.

Data There are six datapoints worth discussing. **First**, the epistemic unknown inference of *mǒu* should be analysed as a presupposition. Although Mandarin *wh*-indefinites also induce certain epistemic effects and convey ignorance, which are treated as conversational implicatures by Liu & Yang (2021), the epistemic unknown inferences triggered by *mǒu* consistently project across intensional and downward entailing contexts (as shown by the *if*-conditional in 2), suggesting that the status of the epistemic effects of *mǒu* is presuppositional.

- (2) Ruguǒ tā mǒu gè shíjiān zài lái dǎrǎo nǐ, qǐng gào sù wǒ.
if he MOU CL time again come bother you please tell me
Lit. ‘If he comes to bother you at some time again, please let me know.’

\Rightarrow There exists an evaluator (most likely, the speaker) who does not know when he comes to bother the addressee again.

Second, the epistemic unknown inference of *mǒu* is relativized to a sentient evaluator, to whom the ignorance inference is attributed. Usually, an evaluator is resolved to the speaker but other sentient attitude holders are also possible. The evaluator can also be bound by a quantifier as shown in (3), showing that an evaluator index should be postulated in *mǒu*’s lexical semantics.

- (3) Guòqù yī nián, měi gè xuéshēng dōu yīnwéi jiēchù guò mǒu yī xiē cáiliào guòmǐn.
past one year every CL student DOU because contact GUO MOU one CL material allergy
Lit. ‘During last year every student were allergic because of contacting some material.’

The bound evaluator reading: for every student *x*, there exists material *y*, *x* was allergic after contacting *y* and *x* doesn’t know what *x* contacted).

Third, unlike English *whatever* that is compatible with both ignorance and indifference (von Stechow 2000), Mandarin *mǒu* tends to convey only epistemic ignorance but not agent indifference as witnessed by the following example.

- (4) Zhāngsān ná le zhuōzishang de mǒu bǎ yǔsǎn jiù chōng le chūqù.
Zhangsan take LE table DE MOU CL umbrella JIU rush LE out
Lit. ‘Zhangsan took some umbrella on the table and then rushed out.’

⇒ An evaluator, possibly, the speaker doesn't know which umbrella ZS took.

⇒ Zhangsan doesn't care which umbrella he took.

Fourth, given *mǒu*'s ability to induce extra epistemic effects and mark insignificant or withheld information, it is not surprising to see that a nominal phrase marked by *mǒu* is not a suitable focus associate of focus-sensitive operators like *zhǐyǒu* 'only' / *yě* 'also' as *mǒu*'s epistemic unknown presupposition might conflict with the final determinization of an alternative set for focus quantification.

- (5) a. # *Zhǐyǒu* [*mǒu* *gè* *tóngxué*]_{+F} *chídào* *le*. b. # [*Mǒu* *gè* *tóngxué*]_{+F} *yě* *chídào* *le*.
 only *MOU* *CL* *student* *late* *LE* *MOU* *CL* *student* *also* *late* *LE*

Fifth, although *mǒu* behaves like an indefinite, it can't be simply considered as variables in the Heim-Kamp tradition as it does not witness any quantificational variability effects (Compare 6a with 6b). Neither can *mǒu* function as a donkey anaphor.

- (6) a. *Tōngcháng*, *yí* *gè* *rén* *huì* *gǎndào* *gūdān*.
 usually *one* *CL* *person* *will* *feel* *lonely*
 Lit. 'Usually one can feel lonely.' ⇒ **Usually** *x* [*x* **is-human**] [*x* **feels lonely**]
 b. *Tōngcháng*, *mǒu* *gè* *rén* *huì* *gǎndào* *gūdān*.
 usually *MOU* *CL* *person* *will* *feel* *lonely*
 ≠ **Usually** *x* [*x* **is-human** ∧ *x* **is-unknown**] [*x* **feels lonely**]

Sixth, like canonical indefinites, *mǒu* can obtain an island-escaping widest scope interpretation in (7), yielding the scopal sequence *mǒu*P >> *if* >> DOU 'all'. Besides, *mǒu*P can also take intermediate scope, yielding a situational-variation reading (*if* >> *mǒu*P >> DOU 'all').

- (7) *Rúguǒ* *měi* *gè* *yuángōng* *dōu* *xuǎnzài* *mǒu* *yì* *tiān* *qǐngjià*, *zhěng* *gè* *bùmén* *de*
 if *every* *CL* *employee* *DOU* *choose* *MOU* *one* *day* *leave* *whole* *CL* *department* *DE*
 yùnzuo *jiù* *shòudào* *yǐngxiǎng*.
 operation *JIU* *get* *affected*

Lit. 'If every employee chooses to ask for a leave on a certain day, the operation of the whole department gets affected.'

Proposal Based on the empirical observations above, we suggest a two-dimensional preliminary semantics of *mǒu* as in (8) wherein the above line encodes the epistemic presupposition (as marked by ∂) relativized to an evaluator index $\mathcal{G}(i)$ with an embedded question semantics, i.e., the evaluator cannot fully resolve the question Q signalled by the sentence containing *mǒu*. The ignorance effect, i.e., not knowing, is formalized as $\mathcal{G}(i) \neg \Box^{\text{Dox}}[\text{Ans}(Q)]$ (the evaluator does not know the answer to the question with **ANS** being an answerhood operator) and Q can be compositionally resolved based on the sentence containing *mǒu* as defined in (8) below.

- (8) $\llbracket mǒu \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{C}}$ *An embedded question-based semantics*

$$= \frac{\partial \llbracket [\exists y_e = \text{Evaluator}(\mathcal{G}(i)) \text{ in } \mathcal{C}] \wedge [\mathcal{G}(i) \neg \Box^{\text{Dox}}[\text{Ans}(Q)]] \rrbracket}{\lambda \mathcal{F} \in \text{CH}_{\langle \langle e, t \rangle, e \rangle}. \lambda f \in \mathcal{D}_{\langle e, t \rangle}. \mathcal{F}(\lambda x_e. f(x))}$$

mǒu introduces a choice-functional variable

$$\text{where } Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\langle \langle s, t \rangle, t \rangle} = \lambda p_{\langle s, t \rangle}. \exists \mathcal{F}_{\langle \langle e, t \rangle, e \rangle}. \mathcal{F}(\lambda x_e. f(x)) \wedge p = \lambda w'. g_{w'}(\mathcal{F}(\lambda x_e. f(x))) \\ = \{p \in \mathcal{D}_{\langle s, t \rangle} \mid \exists \mathcal{F}_{\langle \langle e, t \rangle, e \rangle}. \mathcal{F}(\lambda x_e. f(x)) \wedge p = \lambda w'. g_{w'}(\mathcal{F}(\lambda x_e. f(x)))\}$$

Instead of treating *mǒu* as introducing variables as in dynamic semantics, its at-issue component (the second line) denotes a choice function, which can be existentially closed at various scopal positions, accounting for the island-insensitive scopal property.

Consequences The lexical entry proposed above shows that scope-taking of *mǒu* and resolving the value of an evaluator (i.e., resolved to the speaker in an utterance context) are two independent processes, which are responsible for deriving both *scopal specificity* and *epistemic specificity* witnessed by Mandarin *mǒu* (varieties of specificity have been discussed in the literature e.g., Enç 1991 and von Heusinger 2002).

Selected References Alonso-Ovalle & Menéndez-Benito (2015). *Epistemic Indefinites*. OUP; von Heusinger (2002). Specificity and definiteness in sentence and discourse structure. *Journal of Semantics*, Vol. 19 (3), p.245-274.

多聲性標記“並”的反向並列意義及其歷史來源

袁毓林

澳門大學 人文學院 中國語言文學系

電子郵箱：yuanyl@pku.edu.cn

本文打算從分析副詞“並”的各種實際用法和相關的歷史語料入手，引入語言多聲性（polyphony）和論辯性（argumentativity）等觀念，來研究副詞“並”的語義功能和歷史來源。首先，評價有關對於副詞“並”的語法功能的總結，確認“並”是一個語言多聲性的標記，具有強制先設的語法功能和表示反駁的話語功能。然後，在由轉折句的有關分句組成的話語序列中，明確地鎖定“並”的語義功能：表示預期與實際結果的反向並列和轉折關係，揭示典型的“並”字句“A，[但是]並不 B”的語義推理程式是：通常是“A→B”，但實際上是“A→C（=¬B）”。接著，從“並”字句在話語結構中的分佈和資訊地位的角度，揭示“並”強調否定的語氣功能的實現條件：處於前景小句中能夠充分實現其強調功能，處於背景小句中就會削弱其強調功能。進一步，從語義功能和話語變換的角度，追溯語氣副詞“並”來源於範圍副詞和關聯副詞這兩種可能的演變路徑；承認用於否定句中的範圍副詞“並”，有可能是語氣副詞“並”的來源之一；但是，連接分句並且表示並列或遞進關係的“並”，更加可能是強調否定的語氣副詞“並”的來源。還從“並”的多重歷史來源（“並、併、並”）和“並”的連接功能的語義包容性（並列、遞進、附加）方面，解釋現代漢語“並”的意義和用法的複雜性的根源。從而回答前述虛詞研究的兩個最根本的問題：「並」的語法意義是什麼？為什麼這種語法意義要用「並」這個詞來表達？

會議其他信息

交通信息：

本次會議為嘉賓們提供專車接送服務。專車將於 6 月 20 日及 21 日早上（具體時間待定）由沙田凱悅酒店出發前往會場。如您錯過專車，請在大學站搭乘大學校巴 2 號線，在馮景禧樓站下車，前往馮景禧樓太古堂二號演講廳參加會議。

會議事務聯絡人：

薛博 852 5601 5585 XUEBo@link.cuhk.edu.hk

任茜茜 852 5320 5778 qianqianren@cuhk.edu.hk

會議主辦單位：

香港中文大學語言學及現代語言系

香港新界沙田香港中文大學梁球鋸樓 G17 室

