

中外语言文学学术文库

# 中西对比语言学 ——历史与哲学思考

Contrastive Linguistics in China  
and the West  
— Historical and Philosophical

潘文国 谭慧敏 著



(下)



华东师范大学出版社

East China Normal University Press

中外语言文学学术文库

# 中西对比语言学

## ——历史与哲学思考（下）

Contrastive Linguistics in  
China and the West

——Historical and Philosophical

潘文国 谭慧敏 著



华东师范大学出版社

East China Normal University Press



# 目录

## CONTENTS

### 第三章 中国对比研究简史（下） / 281

- 3.1 第三期（1956-1976）：  
“暂拟系统”——汉语语法“共同纲领”的确立 / 281
- 3.2 第四期（1977-1989）：旨在为二语教学服务的对比研究 / 298
- 3.3 第五期（1990-）：瞄准普通语言学的汉外对比研究 / 310

### 第四章 对比语言学的本体论 / 389

- 4.1 从历史到哲学 / 389
- 4.2 对比语言学的基础论——哲学语言观 / 391
- 4.3 对比语言学的学科论——目标与范围 / 430
- 4.4 对比语言学的本质论——对比观与异同观 / 469
- 4.5 对比语言学的再定义 / 487

### 第五章 对比语言学的方法论 / 497

- 5.1 方法论研究的回顾 / 497
- 5.2 方法论研究的原则 / 502
- 5.3 对比研究的出发点 / 570
- 5.4 对比的方向性 / 592
- 5.5 求同求异的方法论 / 604

### 参考文献 / 612

## 第三章

### 中国对比研究简史（下）

#### Chapter 3 Contrastive Linguistics in China II

##### 3.1 第三期（1956—1976）：“暂拟系统”——汉语语法“共同纲领”<sup>1</sup>的确立

##### 3.1 Phase 3 (1956—1976): The establishment of the “Provisional Schema”, a “Common Programme” for Chinese grammar

###### 3.1.1 为什么要在1955—1956年之间“切一刀”？

###### 3.1.1 The need to divide 1955—1956

在几年前的文章（潘文国，2002a）中，我们把中国对比语言学的发展只分为两个时期，第一个时期从《马氏文通》起到1976年为止，第二个时期从1977年开始到现在。本书是在此基础上，对这两个时期再作进一步的细分。其中第一个时期细分为三期。第一期主要是《马氏文通》和马派著作如章士钊的《中等国文典》（1907）等，截止到1921年只是取其便利，因为我们把第二期的开始定在1922年；第二期以陈承泽《国文法草创》和胡以鲁《国语学草创》的出版为标志，理由未必很充分，因为同时或前后还有一些别的著作也发出了同样的呼吁，<sup>2</sup>只是陈的态度最鲜明，影响也较大，胡的著作从历史角度看更

1 汉语语法“共同纲领”一词，首见于吕叔湘、朱德熙《语法修辞讲话》序。The phrase “Common Programme for Chinese grammar” was first adopted in the preface to *Lectures on Grammar and Rhetoric* (1952) by Lü Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi.

2 如刘复的《中国文法通论》（1920）和金兆梓的《国文法之研究》（1922）。For example, Liu Fu's *A General Programme for Chinese Grammar* (1920) and Jin Zhaozi's *A Study on Chinese Grammar* (1922).

值得重视，因此我们以他们俩作为代表。这一期的对比主要是在反“模仿”声中努力建构汉语语法体系。区分一、二两期是为了区分“求同”和“求异”的不同追求目标，一期是求同，二期是求异，这在对比研究中有重要意义，最好不要加以混淆。第二期的下限和第三期的开始，我们分别定在1955和1956年，这种分期法在汉语语法发展史上是从来没有过的，可说是破天荒的，特别是将一贯并在一起提及的“建国后几次语法大讨论”也被分开了，<sup>1</sup>恐怕会引起许多人的诧异以至反对。因此需要重点作一些说明。

This portion of the book on the development in China is based on a previous paper by Pan Wenguo (2003b). In that paper, there were only two broad periods, with the first beginning from *Mashi Wentong* until 1976 and the next period since 1977. Here, we would like to put in more time pockets to allow filling in microscopic details to paint a better picture. Some of these demarcations may not have sufficient grounds although there are reasons to do so, out of convenience included. More specifically, the period from 1898 to 1977 is segmented further into three. The first, marked by *Mashi Wentong* and related works such as *Intermediate Grammar of Chinese* (1907) by Zhang Shizhao, ends in 1921 for Chen Chengze (1922) and Hu Yilu (1923) to be featured in the second phase starting from 1922. This is not at all fair as there are other publications before Chen and Hu working on the same theme or concerns, only that in the historical context, Chen's has a greater influence with the strongest stance in anti-imitation while Hu's offers greater significance from the historical perspective in his effort to construct a real grammar of Chinese. On top of this apparent favouritism, a good reason for division into the two periods is to distinguish the different objects in “seeking likenesses” for Phase 1 and “seeking differences” for Phase 2. These two objects are accorded with great importance in contrastive studies and will not be confused. But what could be most inconceivable, questionable and objectionable is the decision to assign 1955 as the ending of Phase 2 and 1956 the beginning of Phase 3. As we know in the periods before and after, there was a series of great debates on Chinese grammar as a continuous progression.

1 关于主语宾语问题的第二次“大讨论”发生在1955—1956年，关于单句复句的第三次“大讨论”发生在1957年。

The second debate of 1955—1956 concerns issues on subject and object while the third debate in 1957 centred on simple and complex sentences.

Such unprecedented and seemingly illogical historiography and demarcation of Chinese grammatical development warrants detailed explanation.

1953年的“建国后第一次语法大讨论”——关于汉语的实词能否分类的讨论，到1955年基本告一段落，讨论文章汇成《汉语的词类问题》（第一、二集）、《语法论集》（第一、二集），从1955年起先后出版；从1954年开始的“暂拟汉语教学语法系统”经过两年多的酝酿、试用，到1956年正式推行，首先在1956年秋季入学的中学新生中使用。<sup>1</sup>这两件事在汉语语法史上有重要意义，因为前一件事标志着一个时期的结束，后一件事标志着一个新的时期的开始。以此来划界是完全有道理的。

1953 witnessed the first great debate on Chinese grammar since the birth of the People's Republic of China. It was a debate on the need to classify notional words that concluded in 1955 with a series of publications in the few years that followed, *Issues in Word Classification in Chinese* Vols. 1 and 2 (1955/56); *Essays on Chinese Grammar* Vol. 1 and 2 (1955/56). Arising from the debate, A Provisional Schema of Grammar for Teaching Chinese at High School ("Provisional Schema") was designed in 1954 and formalized in 1956 after two years of pilot testing. Both are indicative events in the grammatical history of Chinese. The first signified the close of an episode while the latter the opening of a new chapter. This consideration is not entirely without grounds.

说前一件事标志着一个时期的结束，我们要从这场讨论与前一时期汉语研究的关系上去看。上一个时期，是以反“模仿”为标志，积极构建汉语语法体系的时期。从陈承泽（1922）到高名凯（1948）无不如此。从陈承泽、黎锦熙、王力、何容、吕叔湘到高名凯，所发现的汉语最大特点，无一不是汉语没有形态，因此汉语语法研究重点在句法。高名凯1953年挑起的这一场讨论其实是这样一条汉语研究主线的顺理成章的继续和发展，“汉语实词不能分类”的思想在前引诸家的著作中虽然没有明说，但隐隐约约都可看出来，或者可按逻辑推断出来。高名凯只是说了一句大实话。但是他天真地估计了形势，没有想到学术讨论背后的政治背景，没有想到同样一句话在五年前也许可说，在五年后就不能说，他大约做梦也梦不到讨论的结果会是这样的“一面倒”，因此他

1 笔者之一有幸是这批新生之一，因此记忆犹新。  
It was first applied to the autumn admission in 1956 where the author Pan Wenguo was among the first students and therefore keeps the memory is fresh.

之至死不服是有理由的。而更使半个世纪后的我们感到苦涩扼腕的是前一时期语法研究风云人物在这场讨论中的尴尬表现。黎锦熙、王力一而再、再而三地进行自我批判和检讨，吕叔湘在“这也可试试，那也有困难”背后实际上是在打太极拳，最后打起了哈哈：“说句笑话，咱们现在都是拿着小本钱做大买卖，尽管议论纷纷，引证的事例左右离不了大路边儿上的那些个。而议论之所以纷纷，恐怕也正是由于本钱有限。”（吕叔湘，1954：173）。我们再看，1956年以后这些人在干什么：高名凯至死不悔，一有机会就要谈词类问题，但此后的工作重心却转向了普通语言学和外来词编纂；王力转向了汉语史、古代汉语、汉语音韵学、汉语词汇研究；<sup>1</sup>连主持“暂拟系统”的张志公，其个人的研究兴趣也转向了辞章学和传统语文教育。他们都不同程度地离开了语法学。惟一留在语法学界的吕叔湘一头扎进“发掘汉语事实”的无边无际的汪洋大海，并经常以钱串子和钱的比喻谆谆教导学生也这样做，<sup>2</sup>这成了相当一段时期汉语语法研究的指导方针。这些事实都清楚不过地表明了一个时期的结束。

When we say that 1955 puts an end to an episode, we are considering the

1 王力在1981年哈尔滨语法讨论会开幕式的发言中特别强调他没有参与“暂拟系统”的起草：“1956年定的那个教学语法——《暂拟语法系统》，现在很多人误会，以为是我参与制定的。有位同志说王力先生参加编的。我否认，没有这个事。”（见王力，1982：23）。

Wang Li denied involvement in the drafting of the “Provisional Schema” speaking at the opening ceremony of the Harbin conference on Grammar in 1981. He said: “On the teaching grammar determined in 1956, the Provisional Schema, many misunderstood that I was involved in the process. One of our fellow comrades said that Mr. Wang Li is involved. I don’t agree. No such thing.” (Wang Li, 1982: 23)

2 这个比喻出自冯梦龙《古今谭概》：“刘阁老尝议丘文庄著述，戏曰：‘丘仲深有一屋散钱，只欠索子。’丘应曰：‘刘希贤有一屋索子，只欠散钱。’”（刘阁老，刘健，字希贤。丘浚，字仲深，谥文庄）1980年在中国语言学会成立大会上，吕叔湘谈了这个比喻，然后说：“你们说散钱和钱串子哪个重要呢？当然成串的钱最有用，可是如果二者不可得而兼，那末，散钱虽然不便携带，捡起一个钱来还有一个钱的用处，光有绳子没有钱可是毫无用处。”（见吕叔湘，1980b：10）

The Ming Dynasty publication *Tales of Past and Present* by Feng Menglong has a story about two literati mocking each other. Liu Jian says: “Qiu has a house full of loose coins, he needs strings.” Qiu replies: “Liu has strings filling his house, he needs loose coins.” Lü Shuxiang cited this story at the inauguration of the Chinese Linguistic Society in 1980 and advised: “Which do you think is more important, strings or coins? When bundled together, coins are most useful, when we cannot get the best of both, then, even though loose coins are inconvenient, they still serve as money. Having strings alone is useless.” (Lü Shuxiang, 1980b: 10)

relations of the debate with that stage of research before. Before the debate, the Chinese were busy tearing down imitation labels and preoccupied with constructing a Chinese grammar, from Chen Chengze (1922) to Gao Mingkai (1948), without exception. With the efforts of big names at the time, including Chen Chengze, Li Jinxi, Wang Li, He Rong, Lü Shuxiang and Gao Mingkai, the biggest discovery in terms of Chinese characteristics is reaffirming the absence of morphology in Chinese and channelling all energy into syntactic research. The cogitation initiated by Gao Mingkai in 1953 was in reality a natural continuity of this research tenor. Tacit between the lines in the works of all the above-mentioned, was the logical deduction that “classification of notional words in Chinese is irrelevant”. Honouring it explicitly was in fact Gao’s ignorance of the political background acting behind academic discussions. Until his last breath, Gao did not understand why just five years previously something that could be freely uttered could create such a drastic and completely lopsided difference five years later. And half a century later, we could not help agonizing and feeling disappointed for these big names to have had to live through the awkward predicament. We see the numerous self-criticisms Li Jinxi and Wang Li made and we hear Lü Shuxiang saying: “we could try this”, “that method is not without difficulties”—they were all trying to play tactics and to laugh it off at the end of the day, and we quote Lü Shuxiang: “Tell you a joke: we are doing big business with little start-off fund. With so much discussions on going, all that we could list as evidences are that few examples by the sidelines. And it’s probably because we only have this much to say, we need to discuss even more” (Lü Shuxiang, 1954: 173). Let us turn to their development after 1956: Gao Mingkai, though insistent and taking every opportunity to reiterate, switched his focus to general linguistics and the compilation of loan words nevertheless; Wang Li directed his efforts to historical linguistics of Chinese, classical Chinese, Chinese phonology, Chinese lexicology; even Zhang Zhigong, presiding over the “Provisional Schema”, dedicated himself to fields of text composition and rhetoric and traditional language education. They have all steered away from grammar to different extents. The only one who has persevered was Lü Shuxiang and he encouraged his students to join him with an analogy of coins and strings for coins. “Unearthing the facts of Chinese”, the life devotion of Lü Shuxiang, is to some extent the guiding principle of this period.



All these point to the fact that it is over—an episode has been closed.

“暂拟系统”的推出是汉语语法研究史上的另一件大事。我们注意到，在第二期的对比研究中，中国学者已经做出了很大的成绩，但他们这些成绩一般都是作为学者的个人研究成就，除少数以外，很少用于课堂教学，特别是中小学课堂教学。马建忠期望的让“童蒙”从一开始就学习语法的想法在他之后的半个世纪里基本上是落空的。新中国成立后，1950年5月21日《人民日报》发表短评，号召大家“都来注意文法”；1951年6月6日，《人民日报》发表社论《正确地使用祖国的语言，为语言的纯洁和健康而斗争！》，指出：“我们的学校无论小学、中学或大学都没有正式的内容完备的语法课程。”号召人们学习语法、修辞和逻辑。并且从同一天开始，连载吕叔湘、朱德熙的《语法修辞讲话》，此后不久，《中国语文》杂志开始连载中国科学院语言研究所语法小组的《语法讲话》，<sup>1</sup>《语文学习》杂志开始连载张志公的《汉语语法常识》，出现了全国范围的学习语法、教学语法、研究语法的热潮，短短几年里，出版了上百种语法著作。在这种情况下，语法体系分歧的矛盾突出了。不同的体系，其实代表了不同作者的语言观、语法观，以及对于国外理论、汉语事实等不同的理解，本来可以通过争鸣的方式，使人们的认识不断深入。但在当时急于要把语法教学推广到中小学去的形势下，没有时间进行这一工作。1954年国家决定中学语文教学“汉语”“文学”分科，必须为新设的“汉语”课编写教材。在这样的情况下，教育部委托《汉语》教材的主编张志公牵头，主持制定“暂拟汉语教学语法系统”（以下简称“暂拟系统”），经过两年多的艰苦工作，于1956年推出。首先在全国中学汉语教学中全面推行，接着也推广到了高校和社会上。

The big bang in the history of Chinese linguistics is putting in place the “provisional Schema”. We noticed that the contrastive studies of Phase 2 flourished with results. But those are scholastic contributions of the individual not appropriate for classroom teaching, particularly not for primary and high schools. The ideal of Ma Jianzhong for grammar learning to begin with young children was still not realized 50 years after his departure. At the birth of new China, *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) posted a short commentary on 21 May 1950 to call for awareness in

1 1961年正式出版时改为《现代汉语语法讲话》，由丁声树、李荣等8人署名。

As mentioned in Chapter 2, these were compiled and published as *Notes on Modern Chinese Grammar* in 1961 in the names of Ding Shengshu, Li Rong and others.

grammar. The paper gave an editorial comment again on 6 June 1951 entitled “Use National Language Right, Strive for Pure and Healthy Language”, pointing out that: “In our school system, be it primary, high school or university, there is not an official and complete course of grammar”. The editorial called for the learning of grammar, rhetoric and logic. Starting on the same day, it ran a series of articles by Lü Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi on “Grammar and Rhetoric”. Not long afterwards, the journal *Zhongguo Yuwen* began running a series of articles on “Grammar” by the Grammar Group of the Academia Sinica. Yet another journal, *Yuwen Xuexi* ran a series on “Common Knowledge in Chinese Grammar” by Zhang Zhigong. In just a short while, the whole nation was in a grammar-learning fervour, and over a hundred types of grammars were made available in just a few years. It is not difficult to imagine the divided opinions among the represented views carrying a variety of language perspectives, grammar perspectives and different applications of western theories on Chinese linguistic facts. Actually, given time, reconciliation could have been reached as discussions gained deeper ground. But in an urgency to spread grammar to schools, nothing can wait. In 1954, a national decree split language teaching into two subjects: “Chinese language” and “Literature”. As a new curriculum, a new set of teaching material had to be made ready and Zhang Zhigong, who had edited a teaching series, *Chinese Language*, was commissioned by Ministry of Education to draft the “Provisional Schema”. The Provisional Schema was officially adopted in 1956, first in high school, then in university and the community.

“暂拟系统”的出现恐怕是世界语言和语法教学史上的一个创新，这件事情的得失很值得好好总结。按照主持者当时的设想，“暂拟汉语教学语法系统”这个名称包含着以下三层意思：“它是‘暂拟’的，意思是说，它不是固定不移的，而是有待改进的；它只是适用于学校的‘汉语教学’的，语法研究不受此限；它只是一个‘系统’，就是教学中用的这么‘一套’讲法，还谈不上是个严密的、完善的‘体系’。”（张志公，1980a：470—471）但实际上因为没有人预想到中学统编教材可能产生的威力，因此这三个方面可说全部“事与愿违”：第一，由于教材要求相对稳定，中学教育涉及全国几千万人，更不宜常变，因此一“暂拟”就“暂”了25年，尽管“汉语”“文学”分科只试行了两年，尽管25年里批评的声音不断；第二，由于中学汉语师资是高校培养的，因而为了两者衔接，高校语法教学也纷纷采取与之相同或尽可能相似的

体系，“语法研究”理论上说是不受限制，实际上不得不跟着它的路子走，至少必须以它为前提或出发点，客观上造成了极大限制；第三，尽管编者认为只是“一套”说法，但由于这“一套”为几千万人所用，为千万人所熟悉，对绝大多数非专业人士来说实际上成了“惟一”的说法，<sup>1</sup>别的“说法”此后都淡出了，连当初威震语法界的“三大家”著作，在有了暂拟系统之后，除了少数专业研究者外，也不大有人读了。在全国绝大多数人包括知识分子的心目中，“暂拟系统”就是汉语的语法系统，汉语的语法系统就是“暂拟系统”，两者之间是可以划等号的。

The “Provisional Schema” is by any standard, an innovation in the world in the history of language teaching and grammar teaching and deserves a fair assessment. As the name implied, the Provisional Schema of Grammar for Teaching Chinese at High School has at its initial intention to mean: (1) “Provisional”, to be further improved; (2) appropriate for grammar teaching in schools only, not including grammatical research; and (3) it is only a schema for instructional needs and could not be taken as a rigorous “system” (Zhang Zhigong, 1980a: 470—471). However, no one has ever really expected the far-reaching influence of a high school curriculum. So, in fact, the three intentions become good. Despite the new curriculum on “Chinese” being halted two years later, the “Provisional Schema” was there to stay for another 25 years, never mind the continuous disparagement. In addition, considering the fact that high school teachers are groomed by higher institutions, higher institutions would have to adopt the same schema for consistency. Worse still, the non-binding clause on research turned restrictive and became guiding since the schema is often taken as the proposition or the base point to begin with. Consequentially, notwithstanding that its designers think it represents merely one possible explanation; with a user population in counts of millions, it became the *de facto* model, except in the eyes of the professionals in minority. Having forced out all other models, including the three masterpieces that were holding high at one time, most Chinese refer only to the “Provisional Schema” and gradually equate the “Provisional Schema” and the grammatical system for Chinese, intellectuals alike.

1 不妨比较一下中国高考和美国TOFEL考试的“指挥棒”作用。

It may be interesting to compare the “guiding” effect of the higher examination of China and TOFEL of the US.

因此“暂拟系统”出现以后，不管主持者原来的初衷如何，不管支持或反对者态度有多强烈，汉语语法研究很难回到1955年之前的状况中去了。说得通俗点，在此之前是“无法无天”，人人可以写一本书，说这就是“法”；而在此之后，是“有法有天”，你要发表什么意见，得先看看这“法”上是怎么说的，然后再说。这也是第二、三次，特别是第三次所谓的“语法大讨论”后来进行不下去，只得不了了之的一个原因。

As we can see, with the “Provisional Schema” in place, regardless of its initial intentions, regardless of the objections, grammatical studies will never return to the days before 1955 where anyone could just call their publication a grammar. Now, there is the law to refer to before you could have your free comment. In this light, it is easy to see why the two following “great” debates could not reach far.

### 3.1.2 “暂拟系统”在理论上的特色及带来的问题

#### 3.1.2 The “Provisional Schema”: theoretical characteristics and issues

“暂拟系统”的建立，不仅在形式上开始了一个新时期，使汉语从“没有语法”到“有了语法”，从“诸侯混战”到“定于一统”；在内容上也改变了汉语语法研究的方向，结束了近半个世纪来汉语语法研究的基本方向，而开始了一个新的方向。关于这一点，很多汉语语法研究者是不愿承认的，但是如果我们能跳出汉语语法界的圈子，从“局外人”的眼光来看，会得到一个清晰的认识。

The “Provisional Schema” is more than symbolic in its marking of a new era. Its mere presence demonstrates that Chinese has progressed from an “absence of grammar” to “having a grammar”, from “divided thoughts” to “benchmarking”; and more than that, grammatical studies take on a new direction, departing from the fundamentals of the past 50 years. Not many Chinese linguistic researchers have the heart to admit this, but unless we do that, we will not see a clear picture.

我们习惯上总以为，“暂拟系统”是个综合性的系统，是对此前各家语法体系采取“取长补短”、“折衷平衡”的结果，原先各家的基本面貌照理应该还在。但是如果我们仔细比较“暂拟系统”与前此各家的体系，就会发现实际上早已貌合神离。“暂拟系统”所综合的主要是五家体系：黎锦熙、王力、吕叔湘、张志公，以及中科院语法小组的《语法讲话》，但这五家无一例外都是

采取“句法本位”的，即以句法领先词法，词法在各家书里都只是偶而一提，根本不占重要地位。这可以说是通过整整半个世纪的汉语和西方语言对比形成的汉语语法重要传统，是从马建忠到王力的一条汉语语法研究发展线索。<sup>1</sup>然而这个传统在“暂拟系统”里不见了，“暂拟系统”赫然有着词法、句法两大块，而且是词法在前，引领句法！可见这一系统并非简单地对各家系统的“整合”，而是另有指导思想，这个指导思想就是以斯大林为代表的苏联语言学。

The “Provisional Schema” was founded on five models: Li Jinxi, Wang Li, Lü Shuxiang, Zhang Zhigong and the *Lectures on Modern Chinese Grammar* by the Grammar Group of the Academia Sinica. In turn, these five models trod along the same natural line of grammatical development from Ma Jianzhong to Wang Li. Fifty years of contrastive studies involving Chinese and the western languages have evolved a syntax-based tradition and the five were consistent as syntax-based models. Morphology was touched upon sparingly. We like to think of the “Provisional Schema” as a comprehensive system, adapting the strengths, complementing the shortcomings of the various models, compromised and balanced. A careful comparison will prove this to be a wishful thinking. The “Provisional Schema” has lost the syntax-based tradition: we find both morphology and syntax in it with morphology guiding syntax. This shows that the “Provisional Schema” is not a simple “integration”. It has a guiding principle behind it—the Soviet linguistic tradition represented by Joseph V. Stalin (1878—1953).

1950年7月，斯大林的《马克思主义和语言学问题》在苏联《真理报》上发表，同月，文章中译文在《人民日报》上发表，10月出版了单行本。这篇文章就成为中国语言学研究最高指导思想，凡与此不合的就都属于“资产阶级的”、“唯心主义的”，受到批判和排斥。斯大林在书中指出：“语法（词法、句法）是词的变化规则和用词造句的规则之汇集。”（斯大林，1950：17）这就为汉语中必须有词法定下了基调。其后，苏联汉学家龙果夫、康拉德

1. 从这个意义上说，20世纪50年代初高名凯引发的汉语词类问题讨论正是这一线索顺理成章的发展，但高名凯可能没有想到，讨论过程会这样的“一面倒”，而黎、王等居然会“倒戈”，否定自己以前的观点。

In this sense, the discussion on word classification led by Gao Mingkai in the 1950s is a natural consequence. It never occurs to Gao Mingkai that Wang Li and others would give up their previous standpoints.

等人的著作相继在中国出版，他们的观点对中国语言学界来说简直是不容辩驳的，其观点的核心就在于要不要建立词法。例如龙果夫（А. А. Драгунов）说：

Stalin's essay on "Marxism and Problems in Linguistics" posted on *Pravda* on 20 June, 4 July and 2 August 1950 became the highest order for linguistic research in China. It was translated and published on *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) in July and later as a monograph in October 1950. Incongruent views were regarded as "capitalistic" or "idealistic" and must be criticized. In this essay, Stalin states: "Grammar (morphology, syntax) is the collection of rules governing the modification of words and their combination into sentences" (Stalin, 1950: 17). This is how there must be morphology in Chinese. Following this, China published the works of Soviet sinologists: А. А. Драгунов (Alexandr Dragunov, 1900—1955), Н. И. Конрад (N. I. Konrad) and others. Their standpoints on morphology were not to be contested. Dragunov said:

词类是语法系统的中心，它反映在词组的结构和各种类型的句子中。离开词类就不能了解汉语的结构特点，也就不能说明汉语的语法。（龙果夫，1952：9）

Word class is central to grammatical system. It is reflected in the combinations of words and the types of sentences. To understand the structural characteristics of Chinese and describe its grammar, there must be word classes. (Dragunov, 1952: 9)

康拉德（Н.И. Конрад）说：

And Konrad:

长期在汉学界里占优势的汉语单音节性和没有形态性的错误观念使汉语遭受到很大的损害，它引起汉语的“没有语法论”，同时长期地妨碍了这种语法的科学探讨。（康拉德，1952：48—49）

Long in the field of sinology, there is this very wrong concept about Chinese being monosyllabic and having no morphology. It has done harm to the Chinese language for it leads to the conclusion that Chinese has no grammar and hampered any possible scientific discussion in Chinese grammar. (Konrad, 1952: 48—49)

如果我们要了解这些观点对中国学者的影响到底有多深，我们不妨看看一位有影响的学者在批评高名凯“实词不能分类”论时所说的一段话：“……按照这种‘理论’只好取消汉语语法中的词法，取消了词法意味着进入句子的单词本身并无一定的语法特征，因此也就在实质上取消了句法，最后也就不得不否认汉语语法的客观存在。”（胡明扬，1955：79）按照这个逻辑，承认汉语有语法就必须承认汉语有词法，要研究汉语语法就必须先研究汉语词法，因而在汉语语法研究中突出词法成了当时的首要选择。正是在这个背景下，上世纪五十年代出现了寻找汉语形态的高潮，而作为“共同纲领”的“暂拟系统”，首先体现的是中国的语法研究者并不“共同”的词法领先原则。

To gain an understanding of how these views have changed Chinese scholars, let's look at how a heavyweight scholar dressed down Gao Mingkai's claim that notional words cannot be classified: "...complying to this kind of 'theory' we could only abolish morphology in Chinese grammar, and this is as good as saying that word by itself has no determinable grammatical characteristics. Since words are the building blocks of sentence, abolishing morphology implies abolishing syntax, thereby denying the objective existence of Chinese grammar" (Hu Mingyang, 1955: 79). Going by this logic, to acknowledge Chinese grammar, it was necessary to admit that there is morphology in Chinese, and grammatical studies in Chinese have to start with morphology. Therefore it was important to give priority to morphology in grammatical studies at that time. It is against this background that we saw a height in morphological studies in the 1950s. As with the "Common Programme", the "Provisional Schema" was quick to present something not quite within the consensus among Chinese linguistic researchers.

如果承认这个事实，随之而来的就是一个难以回避的问题：这一转变对汉语语法研究史的影响究竟如何？因为事实上只有两种可能，一是这一改变是对的，那就意味着从黎锦熙到高名凯的这四分之一个世纪的方向是错的；一是原先的方向是对的，那么这一改变的指导思想就是错的。可惜这个问题从来没有被很好回答过。五十年代是没人敢提，后来则习惯成自然，甚至很多人以为汉语语法本来就是那样的。但我们想，到了今天，不应该再回避了。<sup>1</sup>

1 这首先是个理论问题，与这些年来词法研究本身取得的成绩无关。  
This is a theoretical question to be separated from any findings in morphological studies throughout these years.

If we admit to this fact, the next question that confronts us would be: how has this shift impacted on the history of Chinese grammatical studies? Well, there can be only two possible answers: the shift is right, and that means for a quarter of a century from Li Jinxi to Gao Mingkai, we had been going on the wrong track. The other answer is the opposite. The shift is wrong, and what we had been doing before the shift is not wrong. For the past 50 years, the questions have not been raised nor answered. It has been taken for granted, so much so that many tend to think that this is the true Chinese grammar. It's high time we faced it honestly.

### 3.1.3 “暂拟系统”对汉外对比研究的影响

#### 3.1.3 Effect of the “Provisional Schema” on Chinese-foreign-language contrastive studies

“暂拟系统”的建立，标志着在经过了50多年的纷争之后，中国终于有了一个至少“暂时”为各方接受的汉语语法的“共同纲领”。“共同纲领”在普及语法知识、推广语法教育上的功绩是不可限量的，但对学术研究的深入、理论视野的开拓，其负面影响也是不容小觑的。对于对比研究来说更是致命的。

As mentioned earlier, after 50 years of argument, at least there is a “Provisional Schema” signifying a “Common Programme” in Chinese grammar. Its impact in raising awareness in grammar and promoting grammar teaching is not to be overlooked. However, the discernible negative impact it has on research advancement and theoretical visioning is also alarming. In particular, it has harmed development in contrastive studies.

第一，实际上标志着汉外对比研究的结束或至少告一段落

#### 1. Signifying the termination of Chinese-foreign-language contrastive studies

上半个世纪轰轰烈烈的中外对比，目标是建立“汉语自己的语法”。现在语法体系既已建立，目标已经完成，汉外对比实际上也就宣告结束。之后尽管还有人侈谈什么中西语言之别，实际上已成了“套话”；更有许多人鹦鹉学舌，根本不懂外语或对外语知之甚少，也能开口大谈西方语言如何如何，汉语特点如何如何，但实际上已没有多少人真正关心外语如何如何，而只是在汉语材料内部打圈圈，还自以为是在“发掘汉语特色”。主观上学术研究已经没有这种需要，客观上中国社会从五十年代以后又进入了闭关守国状态，这就使“两张皮”现象的出现成了可能。事实上，从“暂拟系统”诞生之后，到“文



化大革命”结束这20余年里，中国语言学界基本上没有什么语言对比研究可言。即使有对“暂拟系统”不满的，也早已失去上世纪四十年代及以前那种从根本上追究的勇气，而只是满足于方法之争、术语之争，自以为这就是“理论研究”。在这期间惟一可称为对比研究成就是张培基发表于1960年前后的姊妹作：《习语汉译英研究》与《英汉声色词与翻译》，但也只是实践的总结，而没有理论的阐述。吕叔湘时而有一些精彩论述，如1963年关于汉语单双音节的问题，六十年代对汉语语法中“词”是否必要的怀疑（1980：40；46），都涉及到汉语的一些根本性的问题，也是对比研究的好题目。可惜孤掌难鸣，都没有得到很好的展开。最可惜的是王力，他的《中国语法理论》在内容和质量上都不亚于叶斯柏森的《语法哲学》，是中国对比语言学的一座高峰，如果继续这条路走下去，中国对比语言学早就可以在世界语言学上占有一席之地，但五十年代后不得不终止，他本人的研究重点也不得不另转方向。王力1981年反复强调他与“暂拟系统”毫无瓜葛，想来还是对此耿耿于怀吧？

In the first half of the twentieth century, contrastive studies involving Chinese and a foreign language was almost the way to constructing a grammar the Chinese could call its own. So much for the honour; now that there is a system in place, the target has been achieved and the case is closed for Chinese-foreign-language contrastive studies. The voices we continued to hear concerning the differences between Chinese and western languages were probably from people who scarcely know western languages. And in fact, most were self-indulged in their “Chinese characteristics” illusion; few really cared about what was happening to the foreign languages. As the need for contrastive studies diminishes, China, politically, began closing up since the 1950s (and hence the emergence of the “two-skin” phenomenon). Factually, for 20 years from the birth of the “Provisional Schema” until the close of the Cultural Revolution, there was little activity in contrastive studies. Those unhappy with the schema had lost the courage to pursue as in the 1940s and before. Most happily considered that their contention in methodology or terminology could be thought of as “theoretical studies”. In this period, works that could be considered as contrastive studies were *How to Translate Chinese Idioms into English* and *Imitative and Colour Words in English and Their Translation* by Zhang Peiji in the 1960s, both being summaries of practical experiences. Theoretical discussion was rarely seen. At times, Lü Shuxiang would be kind enough to share