

摘要

被动范畴是汉、韩语言学界关注的重要研究课题之一，但是对这两种语言被动范畴的理论解释还有待进一步深入。

本文以三个平面理论为主，以语义靠近理论、可别度领先理论、配价语法理论等为辅，运用对比语言学的研究方法，从共时层面对比分析汉韩被动范畴的形式以及内部语义结构的异同，揭示汉韩被动范畴使用的限制条件，其中汉韩被动范畴使用的条件前人未曾涉及。

总体上，本文的创新点主要有以下几点：

(1) 汉语“被”字句与韩语“-hi-”类被动句都是以受动作或行为影响的受动者为主语或话题的主谓结构句，倾向省略处于次要地位的施动者 NP2。韩语受格标记的制约工具、处所、材料等非受事语义成分不能受事化而成为 NP1 成分，而汉语不受此限制。而且，汉语“被”字句的谓语动词多以复杂的形式表现受动者承受动作影响之后产生的结果或变化状态，偏重谓语动词的动作性和结果性，具有“完整体”的表达功能，能产性高。而韩语“-hi-”类被动句偏重谓语动词的结果性和状态性，可以表达“完整体”或“非完整体”意义，能产性低。

(2) 汉语“遭受”类被动句和韩语“danghada”类被动句都是由处于高层的形式动词构成的词汇型被动句，以主动形式表示被动。汉语多表达受动者受损的、有利害关系的贬义色彩，韩语除“danghada”被动句表示贬义色彩之外，多以中性义色彩为主。另外，汉语动词补足语后面不能再出现补语和 NP3 成分，而韩语的被动结构中可出现 NP3 成分。

(3) 汉语意念被动句和韩语“-eojida”被动句都有别于描述主语属性、且必带副词性修饰语的中动句。形态上，汉语没有被动标记，韩语则借助格标记和补助动词来标记；句法语义上，汉语 NP1 受词序排列的影响，而韩语的 NP1 则借助格标记处于不同的句法位置，不过都以[-有生][+受影响性]为典型的语义特征。动词的选词范围上，汉语因不受被动形态的限制而比韩语的选词范围宽。

(4) 不能使用的原因在于动词自身的词汇意义及携带受事宾语的能力，以及句法语义和上下文语境的制约，韩语还受词汇形态的制约。其次，用与不用被动范畴取决于发话者或写作者的主观意愿。最后，必用被动范畴的条件可归因于：①主语为无生命

体，谓语是自主动作动词；②主语为有生命体，谓语为处置义的及物动词，语义上主语为动作的承受者；③受动者的可别度高于施动者的可别度，句法上强烈要求前置；④后续被动句的底层受事宾语与前接句的主语或宾语具有同指关系，或底层受事宾语与后续句的主语有同指关系。

关键词：被动范畴；三个平面；句法；语义；使用条件；汉韩对比

Abstract

Passives is one of the most eye-catching research topics in the Chinese and the Korean linguistic circle. However, the theoretical explanation of passives in these two languages is still open to further studies.

Based on the Tri-level Grammar, and partially on Semantic Proximity Principle, Identifiability Precedence Principle, Valence Grammar, this dissertation analyzes in a contrastive approach the synchronic similarities and differences in semantic structures of Chinese and Korean passives, and advances the understanding of the restricted conditions on the Chinese and Korean passives, which has not been fully touched up till now.

In a nutshell, the dissertation mainly advances our understandings thereof as follows:

[1] In the Chinese "bei" constructions and the Korean "-hi-" constructions, the patients affected by the action or the behavior are encoded as the subject or the topic, while the less salient agents represented as NP2 tend to be omitted. The Korean passives are restricted by case-marking in that non-patients, e.g. instruments, locations and materials, etc., can not be referents of NP1, while such restrictions do not hold on the Chinese passives. Hence, Chinese outnumbers Korean in felicitous passive constructions. Besides, the predicates of Chinese "bei" passive constructions generally express the results of the action or the state of the participants in complex forms, primarily double-V' structures, which focus on the completion and the results of the predicates, functioning the same as completives. The Chinese passives are more productive. Contrastively less productive, the Korean "-hi-" passive constructions, which focus on the results or the state of the predicates equivalently in function as completives or incompletives, normally take the form of single-V' structures.

[2] Chinese "suffer" passive constructions and Korean "danghada" passive constructions are lexically-geared passives in active forms such that a light verb in high-level node c-commands the substantive verbs. Semantically, Chinese passives normally manifest a heavy affectedness, especially an adverse one, of the patients, while the Korean "danghada" passives in normal cases have a neutral reading other than a derogatory one. In addition, there is no slot following the V-complements for NP3 and predicational complements in the Chinese passives, but one for NP3 in the Korean passives.

[3] Chinese weak passive constructions and Korean "-eojida" passive constructions both are different from the middle voice constructions, which describe the property of the subjects and must take an adverbial modifier. Morphologically, the Chinese weak passive constructions

are unmarked while the Korean equivalents are marked by case markers and auxiliary verbs. Syntactically, in Chinese weak passive constructions, the position of NP1 is affected by word order, while in Korean equivalents, the case-marked NP1 fills in various slots. Semantically, passives thereof prototypically have [-animate][+affected] features. As for the potential verbs, Chinese has a larger pool whereof than Korean does because Chinese is not subject to the formal constraints of passives.

[4] Restrictions on Chinese and Korean passive constructions can be attributed to lexical meaning of the verb itself and its ability of carrying a patient object, and syntactic, semantic and contextual constraints. Besides, Korean is restricted by vocabulary morphology. Secondly, it all depends on the willingness of the speaker or the author whether the passive constructions are used or not. Finally, the passive constructions are compulsory when: ① The subject is inanimate and the predicate is an self-acting verb; ② The subject is animate and the predicate is a disposal transitive verb, semantically with its subject to be the affectee of the action; ③ The patient is higher than the agent on the identifiability scale, resulting in its fronting as a syntactic must; ④ The patient of the passive constructions are co-indexed with the subject or the object of the preceding constructions, or otherwise with the subject of the subsequent constructions.

Key Words: passives; Tri-level; syntax; semantics; restricted conditions; Chinese-Korean contrastive study