

This is our topic today , modality and negation , I finish the chapter4, the last topic. And I think this is one of the important topic in language, modality. We dealt with tense, the time or event. We deal with aspect, the internal cantor of event. The internal cantor of event over time is aspect. And there will only two distinctive aspects, progressive v.s. perfect. So modality. What is modality? If I say you guys are good, you are good students. And then I add perhaps. Is it still true that you are good students? You are good students, I think I guess maybe possibly. You see these things doing to the sentences. they are adding something else to the propositional confirm. The sentence, you are a good student, subject, verb, and predicate. It's clear. That is a proposition and you have propositional information. Remember we talk about that sentence have propositional information. So you are a good student. Everything is clear. But when I add perhaps, possibly, maybe, what is added to that sentence? Uncertainty or possibility. And that's modality. So modality is simply something else added proposition. And what is that something we add? What is uncertainty or possibility? It's basically a judgment. It's a judgment based on what? Based on you subjective mind. It's subjective judgment. It's a perspective. It's an attitude toward the proposition you are stating. So modality is a subjective judgment on

what? On the truth value of the proposition. on the possibility of the proposition. on the certainty of the proposition. on the likelihood of the proposition. that's one thing called epistemic modality. We talk about this before. We are judging the truth value. Certainty, probability, and truth. Another type of judgment. When I say you are a good student, and then I add I hope, I prefer, I wish, you should, you are to. It's different type of judgment. I prefer you to being a good student. What is the kind of judgment? I am not making judgment on truth or certainty. Then what am I judging? My preference, you obligation, I like it or not. so it has nothing to do with truth. It's just my personal preference, intention, or desire. Judgement about obligation. These are called deontic judgment or deontic modality. So modality is simply based on some kind of judgments. And there are two kinds of judgments we are distinguishing here. So modality, a very short information. It's the speaker's attitude. When I say you are probably a good student, I am the one who's making judgment on the speaker. When I say he probably thinks, then it's the speaker's judgment. And this judgment has no effect on the propositional frame and not uttering anything on the proposition. I am not changing anything. I am not changing the subject, the verb, or the object. So I am not utering anything in the proposition. almost no effect on the propositional frame. The same argument structure, the same participant roles,

the same verb type, the same transitivity, the same lexical semantics. Whatever you have in the proposition in the sentence, I am not changing anything. So now you have a clear idea about what proposition is. And when we were in middle school or high school, we learn modal auxiliaries. The most familiar stuff is modal auxiliaries. Why is it called modal? Now you understand. Those auxiliaries “can” “may” “must” “should.” They are makers of modality. That’s why they call modal auxiliaries. 情態助動詞。情態就是你對他的感情的態度。

As I say there are basically two types of judgments. One is epistemic and the other one the book call evaluative but a more linguistic term will be deontic. If we look closer at the epistemic modality, we actually find these four distinctions. There are certainty which is assumed to be always true in a sentence, which is unchallengeable. And it’s called presupposition. Listen to the sentence. If I ask a guy always sitting in the middle and I always like him, wow when did you stop skipping classes? When did you start coming to classes? What do I mean? When did you stop skipping classes? I am asking a question, right? When, a wh-question. So answer my question. When did you stop skipping classes? I never did. He is not answering my question but he is reacting to my presupposition. By uttering a question “when did you stop skipping classed,” I am actually stating presupposition. And I put it in such a way that is already

assumed to be true. It's like asking 一個家暴的丈夫 when are you stop beating you wife? I am making a presupposition, you beat your wife. So this is a very tricky way to ask people and it's always manipulated and used by lawyer in court. So if I told you I don't like the guy you date. What kind of guy are you dating? There is always a presupposition there. And of I say no I am not dating any guy but you are taking it as true so she asked who is the guy you date yesterday. There is a presupposition and what is that? You date someone. Next one, realis assertion, strong assertion but challengeable. This is the part and I assert with my sentence. So when I say you guys are good, I am making an assertion and it is challengeable. You might say no I am not. the weather is good but you say no it's not. that's realis assertion. And then irrealis assertion, weakly assertion possibly likely. Irrealis simply means it's not true although I am asserting it but it's not true not factual. It will or he plans to break up with me. Has he done that? It is true that he broke up with me? Weakly asserted so that's possibly or likely future projection. Next one negation, I negate the truth value. He is not a gentleman at all. Strongly asserted as false. So negation and affirmative sentences. These two are strong assertions. And irrealis assertion or future assertion is weak. And the strongest is the presupposition. You know every time we have some communication conflicts. It's usually due to some

presuppositions you are making. Parents and children always got into these kinds of problems. Why do you always do this? You are asking why. But you are making a assumption that you always did this. 什麼時候你才能負責一點？什麼時候你才能早起？that's problem happening everyday in our house. 什麼時候你才能自己起床？be like a man. Be like a responsible man. My son will get pissed off. I am not a man? I am not responsible? This is presupposition. There are interesting collocations between presupposition and grammatical structures. So we call it grammatical constructions associated with or related to some kinds of presuppositions. When do we see presupposition in a sentence? In these environment, in these constructional positions. Adverbial clauses with realis tense aspects. It is adverbial clause "although" "since" "due to", these are subordinate sentences and adverbial clauses. And when it is realis, it has past tense, or perfect aspect. It's complete realis. Then you have presupposition. Because he has gone away, I decide to leave, too. Although I am not asserting the fact, because I didn't put it in the main clause. It's not the part I asserted. It's the background sentence. It's the background. Subordinate clause. It's assumed to be true. Since he has gone, I take this as true. Although he has gone, this is already assumed. In spite of the fact that he has gone, due to the fact that he has gone, so this is your background. The same as when or why. These are all the

same. A lot of time in your writing class, you think I have written a perfectly grammatical sentence. But the teacher ask you to rewrite the sentence, a lot of time the problem is this. Whatever you would like to assert, you put it in the main clause. Whatever you assume to be true or whatever you already talk about, whatever is given, old information, you put it in the background because you assume people already know. And you add the new information in the main clause as a strong assertion. 寫作的時候這是我常常發現一個重要的問題，你明明是要告訴我一個 new information，可是如果你把它放在 subordinate clause，你就好像 assume 我已經知道，可是你還沒有提過，我就覺得怪怪的，那有一個東西你已經提過很多次了，你又把它放在 main clause,再提一次，我就會覺得 redundant，所以既然這個 presupposition 他是 assume to be true, 通常它放的就是 given information，前面已經提過的，那你藉由它當作一個 background，當作一個 link 然後再 main 才放入你真正要放的東西，既然我前面已經講了這些，既然我喜歡，因為我喜歡英文，所以.....。The second position for a presupposition is participial and adverbial clause. this is actually the same as the previous one although we put it in the participial form 分詞形式，分詞構句。So having finishing the reading. Look at this “having”. Remember we talk about perfect and one of the semantic features of perfect is what? I am actually trying to ask you the differences between “having finishing the reading”

v.s. “finish up this reading’. “having studied” v.s.”studied” at my room. You know following is the main clause. you can say having finishing reading, I spend some time watching TV. Or studying my exam, I am watching TV at the same time. what’s the differences between “having studied” v.s.”studied”? the first one “have studied” is perfect. So what does perfect mean? So when you use perfect, when you say “have studied”, you mean something differently from “studied”. What is progressive? What is perfect? 還記得 perfect always has this meaning of anterior to. So when you use”have studied” you already complete it anterior to I am watching TV right now. So anterior means that I am done that”having studied my homework. And I am watching TV now.” But progressive always means “on-going”, “simultaneity”. So if I say watching TV, I am studying my exam. Studying for my exam, I am reading these two books. So studying the exam “on going at the same time” while I was reading my books. Relative clause, wh-questions, these are other involvement for presuppositions. The girl I talked last day. relative clause. the presupposition is ? i talk a girl last day. Who did you talk last day? The presupposition is you talked someone last day though I don’t know who so I am asking you. It was Ann I talked last day. My assertion is what? My assertion is that it was Ann. But the background information, the presupposition is that I talked some one last day. Now it should

be clear. Interestingly is that certain verb requires a presupposition. When you say I regret that she was not invited, the presupposition is? She was not invited. I don't know who is invited but she is not invited. So whatever you regret about is the thing which has happened which is assumed to be realis, true. 'know' is a weak factitive verb. Whatever you know, you assume to be true. I know that he was in Taichung v.s. I guess. So I know has a stronger assertional force. Presuppositional I know versus I am not sure I guess he was in Taichung. The last one nominalized clauses. When you nominalize an event, you take the event as noun. And what is the feature of noun? What is the unique property of noun? Remember we talked about different lexical meanings. What are the major differences between verbs and nouns? A verb will change over time. but the noun stay relatively stable in time. so noun has temporal stability. So if you take a event and you refer to it as a noun. You are changing it into something stable in time. and what is stable in time? you take it as a fact as a noun existing. It's already existing as a noun. It's a entity. 所以名詞名物化了以後的東西，也是 take it as true. 你有 presupposition, so his coming to the class surprise everyone. The presupposition is ? he came. I am surprised by her moving out. the presupposition is? She moves out. 我們剛剛看到的都是 presupposition 所帶的位置，但我我們講過 modality 有好多不同的情況，那我們現再是看哪一些

的 modality 會跟哪一些的 grammatical structure 配搭，所以通常你如果出現疑問句，否定句，祈使句，這些都有不同的 modality，第一個看起始具 command, request or suggestion，these are future projecting, 那 future projecting 它通常帶的就是 irrealis，所以 irrealis and non-declarative，所以我說 turn on the radio. That's irrealis and future projecting. I don't know whether you have done these. Would you please turn on the radio. Let's turn on the radio. They are all future projecting. So irrealis. Yes/no question, did you turn on the radio? It's a yes/no question. It has no assertainty. I am not sure. It's irrealis. Questions are irrealis too. And what are the other irrealis assertion? Remember negation? So negation, questions, and command. These are irrealis. Now collocation between realis and irrealis. Tense aspect. There are actually more irrealis assertion. It's call conditional clauses. If I say if, only if, when plus future tense, then you will see irrealis assertion too. We emphasize this just because we went over the uses of only before. And I kept saying any seem non-referring. The non-specific entity goes with irrealis modality. 你不知我不知的，不知道是哪一個，the next thing is collocation between irrealis and tense aspect. This is from the book which say past tense is usually realis. It happened and it happened as a specific time point. It is realis. What about present? if it is a state, I am a student. I am stating a fact and the fact is true at the time I speak. If

it's an action I am talking, you are reading. Again I am stating a fact which at the same time as I am talking. So present tense is also realis. What about perfect? Remember perfect means completeness. If it is complete, 做完了, 吃完了, 做了, it is realis, too. Future I will, she will irrealis. What about habitual? The book says it belong to irrealis but I have a doubt why does it belong to irrealis? It maybe true because it happens in the past, now, and future. The reason the author say it's a irrealis because some of the habitual even doesn't have the specific time point. So you can not locate it in a time frame. In that sense, it might be irrealis, remember the habitual I would, I would do something as a habitual future. Not future but irrealis. So this is what we have about the collocation of modality and tense aspect. Modality adverbs. Adverbs are used to modify a verb or an event. So a apparently modality marking is to add some kind of adverbial judgment to the clause so the adverbs are the elements express modality. Epistemic adverbs maybe, probably, possibly, likely, supposedly, surely, and doubtedly. These are all marking epistemic. Epistemic is about truth, certainty, possibility. Deontic adverbs. Preferably, hopefully, ideally.

我們剛剛講的兩個部份，這各部分我們提到時制跟時貌，和情態的關係，所以 tense aspect 跟 modality 的關係，然後這邊我們又看到 adverb 也可以

mark modality，所以我們現在有兩個東西可以 mark modality，哪兩個東西？
tense aspect 跟 adverb，but what if in the same sentence 你的 tense aspect 跟你的
adverb 是不一樣的，what would happen？我既然 tense aspect 可以 mark
modality 我的 adverb 也可以 mark modality，那 which one wins？你覺得誰比
較大，聽誰的？well let's look at this irrealis adverb override the realis tense
aspect，為什麼？就看這就話 maybe she left，"she left" tense aspect is realis，
but we add maybe，is it still realis？"maybe she left"變成 irrealis 了，所以
adverb 比較大，他的 scope 是 over the whole proposition，hopefully they are
studying for midterm，are they studying for midterm？hopefully they are，but
are they？right not sure，所以從這邊你也可以看到為什麼 tense aspect 在英文
裡面叫做 verbal inflections，為什麼他 mark 在動詞上，因為它是跟動詞息息
相關的，與事件本身的動作的部份，可是整個 event 的判斷是在副詞上面，
所以副詞他 predicate 的 scope 是 the whole proposition the whole sentence，可
是 tense aspect 是跟著動作 predicate 本身走的，所以當然是 adverb 的 score
比較大，就可以 override，下面，some adverbs can only occur with certain tense，
那有些 adverb 他的 meaning 就只能跟 certain tense aspect 合用，比方
preferably，你 prefer 的東西 happen，你 desire 的東西，你 wish 的東西 happen
了沒有，你 hope 的事情 happen 了沒，I like to have your homework preferably
by Friday，this is fine，你可不可以說 I had your homework preferably by Friday？

這樣語意上面矛盾，那下面我們就要進入我們最熟析的 modality 跟 modal auxiliary，情態助動詞到底怎麼標記 modality？他們叫作 modal aux 就是因為他們是標記 modality 可是他們是 auxiliary，那通常這些 auxiliary 一加進去以後他就一定變成 irrealis，you can do it，you may do it，you must do it，you should do it，you could you might 都一樣，全部都變成 irrealis，為什麼？因為你的 modal 就已經告訴你是一種 judgment，再加上後面的動詞基本上你就是沒有做什麼 realis assertion，下面 involves either probability，epistemic or deontic，ability，所以 modal aux 也是有兩類既然 modality 有兩類，那我們就來看看這兩類助動詞他們的關係是什麼？先想想看我們過去學的助動詞，什麼叫做 I can do it，he can do it，有哪些 meaning expressed by "can" 那個 can 有多少個 meanings？he can do it，he is able to do it，he has my permission to do it，you ask can I go to the restroom？I say yes you can go to the restroom，you are permitted to，還有沒有 he can do it，it's possible that he can do it，所以剛剛已經有幾個了？ability，permission，possibility，所以一個 can 其實有三個不同的 modality meanings，那這三個是 deontic 還是 epistemic？什麼叫做 he is permitted to do it，he is able to do it，這些都是 deontic，he is able to do it，ability，you are making judgment on his ability，he is permitted to do it，you are making judgment about permission，這兩個其實都是 deontic，因為他們都不是關於 truth，certainty 的，那一但你有 ability

to do it, 你有 permission to do it, 你有沒有可能去做? 了解嗎? 所以那個可能性的判斷 is based on deontic 的 judgment, you have ability so it's very likely you might do it, you have the permission to do it so it is very likely you will do it, 所有的 epistemic marking 其實都是從 deontic 裡面來的, it's deontic, then epistemic, 所有的情態助動詞, 他們最原始的, 最早的的用法都是 deontic, 因為詞彙本來在表達的都是詞彙上的語意, 而不是 grammaticalize, 所以 deontic 是比較有內容的, 比較像 lexical, 不像 functional words, 所以 it's deontic then epistemic, 但是你可不可以反過來說, 你可不可以 vice versa, the reverse is not, 你不可以說, there is possibility he can do it, 就表示他一定有 permission, no this possibility he can do it 它可以 violate permission, violate the rules even though he has no permission, he still 可以去做, 所以 vice versa is not true, 那這個解釋就是 if preference if intend if obligation, if I am making judgment about my preference, you obligation or your intention, then it is uncertain because it is future projecting, 既然是說 future projecting uncertain, since all these values are future projections, it prefers uncertainty, 那這個邏輯上面的 influencing 應該沒有問題, 那我們就來細細看每一個 modal aux, 剛剛講了 can 跟 may, 有三個語意, ability, permission, probability, 所以他的第三個 probability 其實是一種 pragmatic influences 來的, 最早 can 的意思是 know 的意思, 在 old English, can 是 know, I know something, I have the

knowledge, 所以 I am able, 從 know 產生出了 ability 的語意, 再某一些 context 裡面, 你有這個 ability, 同時也表示你有這個 permission, 在一種比方 hierarchical structure 裡面, 你要有 permission, 你要有 permission 你才能夠去做, 所以你的 ability 來自你有 permission, 然後最後才是如果你有 permission, 你有 ability, 你有 most likely you will do it, 才衍生出第三個 probability, so computers can be dangerous, computers can be good, 這是 probability 的判斷, 那 should 跟 must 呢? 他們的語意範圍是什麼? she should come to class, you should come to class, you must come to class versus he should be here by now, well obligation 也是一樣, probability 是什麼呢? they should be here, 是他的 obligation, 但是你的推測是說, they might be wrong, they should be here, 這個不是 obligation, 這是我判斷他這時候應該已經來了, 可是他還沒來, 所以這是 probability 的判斷, 所以 must 我們從小學不就是這兩個 must 媽? 第一個是你的責任, you must study hard, 另外一個 must 是可能性, they must be here 是表示可能性, 不可能是第一個, you must be wrong, 你一定錯了, 你不可能是對的, 那這兩個你有時候分不清楚, 用中文去想想看, 假設我說 you must study hard, 你怎麼翻譯? 你一定要認真讀書, 那 you must be wrong? 你一定是錯的, 所以”一定要”versus”一定是”, 必須 versus 可能, 再中文裏面一樣也有區分, 一定是你錯了, you must be wrong, 一定是他 it must be him, ”一定是” 跟 “一定要”, 必須 versus 可能,

好那接下去我們要講一個很好玩的東西了，前面這邊都應該清楚了沒有問題了，那下面就講到情態助動詞的時態問題了，我們從小老師教的說，**can**，**may**，**will** 是現在式，然後 **could** **might** **would** 是過去式，那今天我們要稍微調整一下這個觀念，沒有錯看起來好像是一個對應的關係，**can/could**，**shall/should**，**will/would**，**may/might**，那請問你我說 **I can do it**，跟 **I could do it**，**would you please do it**？**ok I could do it**，**ok I can do it**，既然這兩句話同樣都是去 **answer would you please do it**，那他們的 **differences** 不應該是在時態上，那到底是什麼？可能性，兩個都是可能性，我們區分哪一個的可能性比較大，**I can do it** 比較大，還是 **I could do it** 比較大？既然都是表示可能性，那什麼叫做一個可能性比較大，一個可能性比較小？**I can do it** 跟 **I could do it** 其實他重點不在可能性的大小，反正可能性就是可能性了，他其實是在表達 **directness** 跟 **indirectness**，他的可能性的大小是從這個來的，我更 **polite** 一些，其實是更 **indirect** 一些，**indirect** 來自哪裡？我們時態上面的改變，所以這邊我要開始介紹假設具跟與事實相反的，我要先開始釐清一些觀念，什麼叫與事實相反？**I am a professor**，但願我是一個教授，如果我是一個教授，這叫與事實相反，如果你是老師，如果是事實我就用一般正常的時態，如果不是事實呢？**If you are a student**，我用 **habitual** 表示可能性，**that's fine**，我們先不講這個，可是我就是要標記說那不是事實，所以我的事實既然是現在式，那我不是事實得我怎麼辦？我不能說 **I am** 我沒有這個

選擇了，那我要怎麼說？我用 I were 我用 past tense，我為什麼用 past tense？我真的是 past 媽？我為什麼用 past 又不是真的再講過去發生的是，所以你就知道哪個 tense 的改變再溝通上面的意涵其實是什麼？告訴你 hey this is something unique，this is something unusual，也就是我們依在強調的那個 mark 的概念，所以不是事實的，我就不能夠用正常的時態，那我就只好用不正常的時態，那不正常的時態是什麼？我就往前推一格，所以與現在事實相反的我就用過去式，那與過去事實相反呢？過去是完成式，其實這樣解釋就很簡單了有什麼問題嗎？所以我過去 if I had been a student，if I had studied hard，與過去事實相反，if I were a student，與現在事實相反的我就往前推一格，那為什麼是往前不往後？往後沒有什麼道理，大家都是 future 沒有什麼道理，所以我們往下看就會看到，其實這些 past modals 呢，都 realized as another modals with different senses，所以 i could do it 跟 I could have do it，這邊的其實都是表示我現在 I could do it I might do it I would do it I should do it，這邊的 I could have done these I should have done these I would have done these I might have done this I should have done this，其實這些都是過去，那除了一個相反的就是這個，你不能用 can have，你只能用 could have，那為什麼？因為 can 跟 could 在目前的語言系統中他還是保留了 past 跟 present 的 contrast，只有 could 跟 can 所以如果我問你過去，你就不能用 can，could you do it？過去的能力 yes I could，but can you do it？yes I can now，

只有 can 跟 could，為什麼？因為他們比其他的詞特別，他們保留了 ability 的 reading，那是其他沒有的，那這個 modal 加 have 呢，除了我們剛剛說表示 past 之外，其實他還有一個 semantic shift 好像他會標記一種與過去事實相反的假設，could 是 ability 跟 probability 跟 permission 我們已經講過了，可是 could do 就只剩下 ability 跟 probability 就沒有 permission 了，if she tried hard, she could have done it，只有表示 ability 或是 probability，那這個 counterfactual 就是像這樣的，if she tried hard，在過去的一個條件之下，she could have done this，這到底是怎麼回事？為什麼我用 could 加上 have，irrealis 的一個 marker，再加上 perfect，那為什麼往前？因該說為什麼用完成式，其實完成式標記的永遠都還是有 anterior 的意思，所以你這個是之前的，你說如果我這時候用功的話，我早就做好了，我們的早就就告訴你它是之前，所以這就是我們用 irrealis 標記他是非事實，所以你就把這個 irrealis 的標記當做非事實，uncertainty, a non-fact，可是 perfect 的部份呢，have done this，表示 anterior，所以既然是如果你用功，你早就通過考試，如果你用功，你早就做好了，這是之前，所以你還是用 have done 的概念，perfect 的 anteriority，so if you tried hard, you could have done this，我剛剛其實試圖去解釋，為什麼英文的與事實的假設會是這種形式，你們了解嗎？這兩個分別在做不同的工作，modality 永遠是 irrealis 所以我需要一個 modality，I could have I might have，那 have 再做什麼？have 是完成式，標記的是 anterior，

我可以這樣想，如果我用未來式來標記與事實相反，不太合邏輯，if I will be a student, 不能表示與事實相反，因為他還是有可能性，只有已經發生的，你沒有辦法改變了，所以我們往前是有道理的，用過去式表示非事實是有道理的，你不能用未來式，you don't have this choice，未來永遠有可能阿，If I will be a student, there is a possibility that you will be a student，所以未來式已經 totally out，那我們就把它當作一個特殊的 marking，所以從否個角度來說，我們還是有那種過去式，然後過去完成，都是一樣的，只是你用 could 來表達 irrealis，就這樣而已，我試圖要把 counterfactual 解釋到你們覺得沒有這麼奇特，他其實 form 跟 meaning 之間的配搭關係還是一體的，還是我們過去學過的東西，沒有什麼特別的，最後 irrealis 跟 verb complement，剛剛我們說過有些動詞她會面自然會帶某種 modality 的補語，那這就是在把這部份延伸一下，有一些動詞她會自動產生出某一種的情態，特別是 irrealis，以前我們學過的動詞類型，還記得嗎？modality verb，為什麼他這邊叫 modality verb，哪些是 modality verb，want/plan/desire/intend，這些叫 modality verb 現在你就懂為什麼了，因為它是一個 deontic modality，I plan I desire I prefer，都是我的 preference 跟 intention，那既然是 preference intention，既然是 deontic 的 modality 當然它就 irrealis，下面 manipulate 也是一樣的，I want you to do it. I ask you to do it. 我 manipulate 別人去做那後面的這些補語，他後面帶的補語，the verb complement，本身都是 future projecting，那

PCU verbs 呢？I thought she left, she imagined she loves him, 這兩個動詞 thought imagine 還有 guess, 這些標記的是 epistemic modality, 那也是 irrealis, 比較是 irrealis 的, versus 剛剛的 know 跟 regret, I know something. I assert it as true, I regret something, 我的 proposition 是 assume to be true, 可是這邊的 thought 跟 imagine, 後面帶的卻是 not certain, irrealis, 最後這邊試圖把語言放到一個更大的架構中, 看 cognitive 跟 communicative 之間的連結, 因為 tense modality 他所牽涉到的其實是一種你對世界的看法的判斷, 所以他當然跟認知還有溝通息息相關, 過去我們也曾經講過這個 markedness 跟 unmarkedness 的觀念, 認知上面比較要求你要花力氣的, 都是 marked 的, 那 marked 的通常在語言中有這三個特色, structurally more complex, 結構上是比較複雜的, 所以你看與事實相反的假設是很頭痛, 結構上比較複雜, 出現在詞彙上面 prince versus princess, waiter versus waitress, doctor versus female doctor, 那個 marked term 通常都是多一點詞彙的, prince versus princess, 所以我們看到 female term 是 structurally more complex, in terms of frequency 呢？在語用上面, 哪一個詞彙用的多, 當然是 unmarked, 因為溝通我們不希望這麼費力, 所以通常是那個 unmarked member 常常出現, 認知上我們已經講過了, marked 就是 harder to process, 那有了這個 background knowledge 之後我們再來看 tense aspect, 我們可以稍微來分一下, 哪一些的 tense aspect 是我們比較容易理解的, 所以是我們 unmarked, 哪些是比較不

容易理解的，所以是我們 mark，這是課本中的一個整理，他說 in terms of modality，已經是事實的，發生的 realis，我把它 assert as true 的，這些比較好了解，已經發生的事情在你的腦海裡面比較清楚，還沒有發生的或是不是 true 的，像 question，command，negation，future tense，是在認知上比較 harder to process 的，in terms of perfectivity 呢？complete 的事件從頭到尾你都看到整個事件的整體，versus imperfective，那 imperfective 包括什麼？perfective 是 perfect 完成式，所以對語言學習者來說，完成式應該是很容易理解的，可是 progressive 是 imperfective，進行式是沒有完成的，那接下來我們看這幾個對照，completeness 是容易的，incompleteness 比較 harder to process，bounded，有一個節點的，有一個範疇的，versus unbounded，compound 一個很緊實的 versus durative，一直連續發生的，durative 有一段時間的，simple past versus perfect，simple past 比較容易 I ate I did my homework，比完成式 I have done this I have completed 容易，所以這些都是相對的，那 sequentiality，事件按照他原來發生的順序來陳述，先後是怎麼樣，比 odd sequence 容易，所以為甚麼我加了完成式以後，那個 contra-sequentiality 讓你的腦袋要轉一下，event-anchor 會比 speech-anchor 容易，event-anchor 就是 simple past 的這種，我在時間坐標裡面，哪一個 event 先發生，那一個就先，跟我這個 speaker 的觀點沒有關係，可是 speech anchor 的就是完成式，因為完成式要有一個 reference time，why? 因為這些 unmarked

的，irrealis/completeness/simple past/ in sequence，這些東西是 more salient，or more vivid or more acceptable in our mind，event that did occur in real time，是比較 acceptable 的，比較 vivid，event that sharply bounded，是認知上面比較 vivid，event that are manipulated in a coherent sequence is easier to process，event that are viewed vividly in an old occurrence time，這些是比較容易理解的，最後一個就是動詞的先後你會先考慮什麼，modal 跟 past 只會出現一個，然後 have 跟 be 動詞，最後課本提到一個很有意思的，就是有一些動詞她到底是 aux 還是一般動詞，他到底是一個 common verb 還是一個 tense modality marker？像什麼？像 have 像 got 像 need，你看這些動詞她很有意思，有一天我在玄奘大學演講，有一個同學問我，他大概是英文老師，他說哪個使役動詞後面接原型，所以你可以說 I make him say，也可以說 I have him leave，還有一個是什麼，I let him leave，可是這裡面只有 make 可以有被動，he was made to leave，你不可以說 he was had to leave，但是我可以說 I had him leave，所以 make/have/let 後面都可以接原型，當作使役動詞，可是只有一個 make，可以有被動，he was made to leave，it was the only one that is acceptable，為什麼？我想答案就跟我們現在要講的東西有關，因為 have 跟 let 他到底是不是一個動詞？是 questionable 的，are they fully functional verbs？所以來看一下 have 他跟 let 有點像，have/got/need，到底是 modal aux 還是 modality verb，就是一個一般動詞？我們來看看他們的表現，任何語言學的 question 都回到

語言的 data 本身，我們就來看它到底怎麼用，she wants to rest，沒問題，she has to rest，she starts to rest，she needs to rest，你看到什麼？你看這些動詞語意上面是不是都蠻像 modality verbs，I want to，she has to，she starts to，she needs to，都是 modality，meaning 上面他們都是一種 modal marking，deontic，irrealis marking，所以語意上他們的確像是一個 modal aux，可是語法上面呢？也就是說 she starts to 就是 she has to，she has to rest 不就像 must 媽？所以她們語意上面很像 modal aux，可是語法上面呢？他們是一個 V 為什麼是一個 V？語意上面他們很像 should，可是語法上面他們是一個 V，而不是助動詞，為什麼？如果是助動詞的話，會不會跟第三人稱 agree？可是你這邊還是有 has，she needs，我們現再看的只是這三個，我們現在講的是 modal aux，這些動詞是不是像一個 true modal aux，我不是在講 tense aspect 的 aux，是 modal aux，億四就是說這些詞彙他正在一個拉扯的 war 當中，語意上面他像是 modal aux 像 should，語法上呢，他還沒有完全變成 auxiliary，所以你還是加上 s，可是他就不像 want 這種非常明顯的 modality verb，為什麼？我們來看一下，因為他不是 completely compatible with all tense aspects，want 可以跟任何的時態合用，但是你看看這些 has，got，need，she has to rest，she starts to rest，with present tense 你就不能說 she gets to rest，she's got to rest，you always use 完成式，所以 I've got to go，不是 I get to go，那個 I've got to go，他根本就是完成式，所以 get 就不能有現在式，他又不

是一個 fully functioning 的 verb，with progressive 呢？不是更奇怪，she's wanting to rest，雖然好像可以接受，可是也不太好，what about she's having to rest？she's needing to rest，你完全不會這樣用的，have to 那個必需的語意，你絕對不會說 she's having to，我需要休息你也絕對不會說 she's needing to rest，所以這些動詞也不會跟 progressive 合用，那他們前面可不可以在加 modal？又好像前面可以加 modal，she might want to leave，she might have to leave，但是 she's got to 前面就不能在加了，你不能說 she might have get to leave，這樣瞭解嗎？所以你再這邊看到一個很亂的 pictures，有的時候他像是一般動詞，有的時候他又像 modal aux，原因就再於他在一種 changing 的 stage，回到我們剛剛的問題，為什麼只有 make 可以用被動？因為只有 make 是一個真正的動詞，have 跟 let，在那個使役的用法裡面，他們的地位，這叫地位位定論，他們的地位不明，他是情態助動詞呢？還是一般動詞？不是這麼清楚。如果你有興趣你可以嘗試我們的 project，剛剛我們提到 can 再英文裡面有三個語意，你嘗試看看中文如何區分這三個語意，這是今天的 brainstorming questions。

否定詞的部份課本裡面蠻多的，可是我給你們的講義裡面好像完全沒有，因為我不想講太多 negation 因為我怕你們的 reading 太多，我只想要講兩個部份，第一個，negation 不是負負得正的觀念，不是邏輯，非 P 則非 Q 的關係，而是什麼，還是一種 working devices，所以負負不會得正，I don't have

any money, 負負, I don't have no money, 負負不會得正, 只是語言用 double 的 means, 來 mark negation, 所以這是 double marking on negation, 而不是邏輯上的負負得正, 同樣詞彙上面, happy 的相反是什麼? unhappy 哪請問 not happy 等不等於 unhappy? 不等於, 哪 happy 也不會等於 I am not unhappy, 負負不會得正, I am not unhappy 不會等於 I am happy 所以負負永遠不會得正, 這不是語言, 這是邏輯, 可是語言不是邏輯, 什麼叫做 I am not unhappy, 就是 I have no feelings, 不見得我一定要 happy, 所以 negation 到底在語言中幹什麼? negation 跟我剛剛講的 presupposition 沒有關係, 任何時候你用 negation 其實他都是一個 mark assertion, 你可以想像一個人一進來, 就講一連串的否定據嗎? 如果我今天沒每一句話都是否定句, 你會覺得好累, you are not a good student, today is not a good day, I didn't go to his house, he didn't tell me, 我如果一直講否定句你得到什麼樣的感覺? they are not doing their jobs, she is not a good student, present ma didn't go to Kaohsiung, he was not elected, 你得到怎麼樣的感受, 我為什麼一直用 not? 我為什麼一直用否定? 你有什麼感覺, 你會覺得我在指責你, 讓你覺得我就是應該要做嗎? 因該是這樣嗎? 為什麼你用否定? 因為否定有一個很強的 presuppositional strength, 我用一個例子來 demonstrate, 今天如果走進一間教室, 我說 hey what's new? 然後我說 mary is pregnant, 很自然的, 喔你知道嗎? 王老師懷孕了, 你覺得這是一個 news, you take this as news, 可是如果今天進來然後

你說 hey mary is not pregnant , do you get that ? why do I say that ? what is the presupposition ? it require an mutual understanding or an assumption , a presupposition that mary is pregnant , 我才會說 mary is not pregmant , 所以否定句很簡單，他 require 那個肯定句的 proposition , somehow 是你的 default assumption , 你一定要 entertain the hearer is heard about/believe or take for granted at least the affirmative assumption , 明天沒有考試啦，我會這樣講就是因為你以為明天要考試，我明天不去台北啦 versus 我明天要去台北，老公打電話說”老婆我明天不會去台北了”because there is a presupposition that he will go to taipei , if there is no assumption, then how can you use 否定？我根本不知道他明天要做什麼，結果他打來說他明天不去台北了，這就我要強調否定一個很重要的特點，那 scope of negation 我想稍微提一下就好了，negation 通常是在 clause 裡面還是在附屬子句，這牽涉我們常常在做的翻譯的考題，I don't think he will past the exam 跟 I think he won't pass the exam , 我不認為他是好老師，跟我認為他不是好老師，國中老師 somehow 告訴我們，你不可以說 I think he will not go , I think he is not a student , I think it's not going to rain , 國中老師是不是這樣講？可是完全沒有道理阿，為什麼我不能說我有一個想法，可是哪個想法本身是否定的，比方你說 I think tomorrow is going to rain , 然後我就說 I think you it won't , 為什麼不行？這其實就是兩種不同的 negation 的 scope 而已，沒有什麼一個可以一個不可以，就是兩

個表達不同的東西，如果我想要表達的是 **this is not my thinking**，**I don't think something is going to happen**，我不認為什麼事情會發生，那我可不可以說我不認為這件事情會發生，我認為這件事情不是你說的那個樣子，我認為他不是一個好學生，**I think he is not a very good student**，為什麼不可以？這句話等於就是 **my thinking is that, he is not a good student, you ask my opinion**，**I think he is not a good student**，可不可以？當然可以阿，哪你說習慣上面哪一種比較常用，你去做一個 **search** 就好了，我為什麼要在這堂課介紹一些 **corpus** 給你，你去查 **corpus** 的資料，查查看有沒有這種句子，沒有什麼道理是不可以的，所以我們解決了一個過去的 **puzzle**，**I don't think he is a good student**，fine，你在 **negation** 的 **scope** 上面是 **negate** 後面的這個子句，**I didn't see that guy who stood in the corner**，**I am not sorry he is lovesick**，當你說 **I am not sorry he is lovesick**，請問他有沒有 **lovesick**？**I am not sorry** 後面這件事情 **is truth**，只是你的 **opinion**，**I don't think he is not a good student**，是我認為他不是，那他到底是不是？跟我認為他不是，**I think, my thinking is that, he is not lovesick**，這就是兩種不同的 **scope of negation**，今天就講到這邊，今天得討論還是跟以前差不多，就是我希望你們能看看中文的動詞，所以我這邊放了幾組，那你們要做幾組隨你們，至少做一組，相信跟懷疑，希望跟要求，後悔和遺憾，勸和說服，那另外兩組你們就去挑，這樣你們會更清楚，這樣好不好？我們就規定一下，我們是不是先 **focus** 在一組就好，這樣

你們的時間就不會花這麼多，就至少做一組，到底相信跟懷疑有什麼不同？後悔和遺憾？希望跟要求？因為這些都跟 **modality** 比較相關，所以請你們去想想看，然後剛剛有兩個同學下課問我，為什麼在表達非是事實的 **be** 動詞都只能用 **were**？if I were you，if she were you，if he were a doctor，if john were my husband，所以第三人稱你也不會用 **was**，那我的答案，從溝通的角度來看，從溝通上來說，我要標記的是非事實，既然是非事實，那個 **agreement** 就沒有意義了，跟本就不需要 **agree** 因為他本來就不是事實，所以我用一個詞來標記的，所以我剛剛一直再強調那個 **were** 標記的不是過去式，我不是用過去式來標記非事實，就是我給你一個特殊的 **marking**，來標記非事實，那這個特殊的 **marking**，一個詞一個 **fixed form** 就已經完成這個功能了，這就是我可以想出的答案，從溝通的角度，那就是一個特殊的標記，那他既然是非事實，**agreement** 就不重要，所以就不用管 **agreement**，我就用一個 **form** 來標記他最重要的語意，非事實的語意，所以他不是 **tense marker**，他是一個 **irrealis marker**。