Abstract

Instead of treating the past participle as a unified form with polysemous functions (i.e., perfect aspect, passive voice, and adjectival modifier/predicate), as assumed in the traditional grammar and advocated by some recent studies (e.g., Wegner 2019), the present thesis argues for the differentiation of three homonymous forms of the past participle, i.e., the perfect participle, the passive participle, and the adjectival participle, with the former two forms taken as two distinct forms in the inflectional verb paradigm, and the latter form as a deverbal adjective. The term "past participle" is thus regarded as a mere superficial cover term for these three homophonous participial forms. The thesis provides evidence that, despite enlightening findings from previous studies (such as Wasow 1977) which show that the adjectival and the passive participle share many common properties, the adjectival participle is more closely related to the perfect participle than to the passive participle in terms of their semantic functions and diachronic relations.

In addition, the present study unravels an intriguing phenomenon attested in English, and in French to a greater extent, which we call the "Stative Gap". The gap noticed is characterized by the lack of simple adjectives in the lexical inventory of a language to denote a pure stative meaning (e.g., 'dead') and by the necessity of using past participial forms (e.g., *mort*, literally 'died' to express 'dead' in French) to fill in the gap. The observation of the "Stative Gap" provides arguments that previous decompositional analyses of the event structure of the past participle (i.e., Embick 2004, 2009; Ramchand 2008, 2018), and the semantic distinction between the "property concept" and the "change-of-state" of the root (i.e., Beavers et al. 2021) are insufficient to explain the semantics of the adjectival participles. The present thesis proposes that there is a certain degree of idiosyncrasy in the conceptualization of roots and the formal encoding of states across languages and that the homonymy of the past participle can be extended to a decompositional level at the syntactic-semantic interface. Two homonymous *-ed*s can be recognized: one is *-ed*$_P$, which is a voice marker found in the passive participle, unmarked of aspect; the other is *-ed*$_A$, which is an aspectual marker found in the adjectival participle and the perfect participle, unmarked of voice.

Keywords: past participle; perfect participle; passive participle; adjectival participle; event structure

摘要

本论文对于"过去分词"这一研究对象，在句法-语义界面做出了新的探索。与传统语法和近年来一些研究（如：Wegner 2019）所持的过去分词的一形多（功能）义的观点（即表达完成体、构成被动语态、作形容词性的修饰语和谓语）不同，本文提出并论证了过去分词是同形异（功能）义的观点，认为过去分词的三个主要语法功能分别对应了三个同形异义的分词形式，即：完成分词、被动分词、形容词性分词。其中，前两个形式属于同一个动词的屈折聚类中的两个不同的动词词形，而第三个形式则是由动词派生出的形容词。因此，传统所谓的"过去分词"实质是一个笼统的描写标签，覆盖了三个同形异义的动词及动词派生词的形式。同时，本文提供了形容词性分词与完成分词在语义功能上和历时演变上更相近的证据，而不是如 Wasow（1977）等研究所认为的形容词性分词与被动分词关系更密切。

此外，本文主要以法语和英语为例，描写了语言中存在的一种"状态形容词缺失"现象：当语言缺失简单形态的形容词来表达纯状态意义（如"死的"）时，过去分词的形式（字面义"死了"）就可能被"征用"来表达这种本该由简单形态形容词表达的状态意义。基于对此现象的观察，本文指出前人以分解的视角对过去分词事件结构的分析（如：Embick 2004，2009；Ramchand 2008，2018），以及对"性质概念"或"状态变化"的词根语义分类的研究（如：Beavers et al. 2021），对于形容词性分词语义的解释都存在不足之处。本文认为，不同语言中词根语义的概念化和状态意义的形式编码存在一定程度的独特性，并且过去分词在语法功能上的同形异义可以延伸到解构的句法-语义界面，即存在两个同形异义的 -ed 语素，一种是语态标记 $-ed_P$，存在于被动分词中，仅表达被动语态、不表达体的意义；另一种是体标记 $-ed_A$，存在于完成分词及形容词性分词中，不表达语态。

关键词：过去分词；完成分词；被动分词；形容词分词；语义事件结构