

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



(上)



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（上）

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

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

中西对比语言学: 历史与哲学思考 / 潘文国, 谭慧敏著. — 上海: 华东师范大学出版社, 2017

(中外语言文学学术文库)

ISBN 978-7-5675-6879-2

I. ①中… II. ①潘… ②谭… III. ①对比语言学—中国、西方国家 IV. ①H0

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2017)第218806号

中西对比语言学——历史与哲学思考

著 者	潘文国 谭慧敏
策划编辑	王 焰
项目编辑	曾 睿
特约审读	汪 燕 纪超然
责任校对	龚海燕
封面设计	金竹林 华君伟
责任印制	张久荣

出版发行	华东师范大学出版社
社 址	上海市中山北路3663号 邮编 200062
网 址	www.ecnupress.com.cn
电 话	021-52713799 行政传真 021-52663760
客服电话	021-52717891 门市(邮购)电话 021-52663760
地 址	上海市中山北路3663号华东师范大学校内先锋路口
网 店	http://hdsdcbs.tmall.com

印 刷 者	上海商务联西印刷有限公司
开 本	710×1000 16开
印 张	40.75
字 数	727千字
版 次	2018年5月第1版
印 次	2018年5月第1次
书 号	ISBN 978-7-5675-6879-2/H.946
定 价	158.00元(上下册)

出 版 人 王 焰

(如发现本版图书有印订质量问题, 请寄回本社客服中心调换或电话021-52717891联系)



《中外语言文学学术文库》

编委会

成员：（按姓氏音序）

辜正坤 何云波 胡壮麟 黄忠廉

蒋承勇 李维屏 李宇明 梁 工

刘建军 刘宓庆 潘文国 钱冠连

沈 弘 谭慧敏 王秉钦 吴岳添

杨晓荣 杨 忠 俞理明 张德明

张绍杰



总序

GENERAL PREFACE

改革开放以来，国内中外语言文学在学术研究领域取得了很多突破性的成果。特别是近二十年来，国内中外语言文学研究领域出版的学术著作大量涌现，既有对中外语言文学宏观的理论阐释和具体的个案解读，也有对研究现状的深度分析以及对中外语言文学研究的长远展望，代表国家水平、具有学术标杆性的优秀学术精品呈现出百花齐放、百家争鸣的可喜局面。

为打造代表国家水平的优秀出版项目，推动中国学术研究的创新发展，华东师范大学出版社依托中国图书评论学会和南京大学中国社会科学研究评价中心合作开发的“中文学术图书引文索引”（CBKCI）最新项目成果，以中外语言文学学术研究为基础，以引用因子（频次）作为遴选标准，汇聚国内该领域最具影响力的专家学者的专著精品，打造了一套开放型的《中外语言文学学术文库》。

本文库是一套创新性与继承性兼容、权威性与学术性并重的中外语言文学原创高端学术精品丛书。该文库作者队伍以国内中外语言文学学科领域的顶尖学者、权威专家、学术中坚力量为主，所收专著是他们的代表作或代表作的最新增订版，是当前学术研究成果的佳作精华，在专业领域具有学术标杆地位。

本文库首次遴选了语言学卷、文学卷、翻译学卷共二十册。其中，语言学卷包括《新编语篇的衔接与连贯》、《中西对比语言学—历史与哲学思考》、《语言学习与教育》、《教育语言学研究在中国》、《美学语言学—语言美和言语美》和《语言的跨面研究》；文学卷主要包括《西方文学“人”的母题研究》、《西方文学与现代性叙事的展开》、《西方长篇小说结构模式研究》、

《英国小说艺术史》、《弥尔顿的撒旦与英国文学传统》、《法国现当代左翼文学》等；翻译学卷包括《翻译理论与技巧研究》、《翻译批评导论》、《翻译方法论》、《近现代中国翻译思想史》等。

本文库收录的这二十册图书，均为四十多年来在中国语言学、文学和翻译学学科领域内知名度高、学术含金量大的原创学术著作。丛书的出版力求在引导学术规范、推动学科建设、提升优秀学术成果的学科影响力等方面为我国人文社会科学研究规范化以及国内学术图书出版的精品化树立标准，为我国的人文社会科学的繁荣发展、精品学术图书规模的建设做出贡献。同时，我们将积极推动这套学术文库参与中国学术出版“走出去”战略，将代表国家水平的中外语言文学学术原创图书推介到国外，构建对外话语体系，提高国际话语权，在学术研究领域传播具有中国特色、中国高度的语言文学学术思想，提升国内优秀学术成果在国际上的影响力。

《中外语言文学学术文库》编委会

2017年10月



双语修订版序

Authors' Note to the Revised Bilingual Edition

本书初版以《中西对比语言学：历史与哲学思考》的名称于2006年在国内出版，一时颇受欢迎。谬赞之余，也有读者感到有些不足，遗憾此书的外文引文没有提供英文文本，因而引用起来颇不方便，特别是需要撰写英文论文的时候。此书其实早在2007年就有英文本问世，与中文本相隔不到一年，由英国著名学术出版社The Continuum出版了，只是那个时候国内一般不容易找到而已。为便于读者使用，我们决定将两书合成一本，以双语对照形式出版。这一想法得到了王焰社长及华东师范大学出版社的支持，今日得以实现。

The original manuscript, first published in China in 2006 under the title *Contrastive Linguistics: History, Philosophy and Methodology*, has met with a warm reception and a wide welcome. Nonetheless, many readers looked forward to having original texts to quotations on foreign articles provided in order that many of the worthy inputs could be easily cited in their own papers in English. In fact, it was little known, due to limited accessibility to publications abroad then, that the original manuscript did have an English version published alongside in Britain in 2007, barely less than a year after its Chinese version, by the well acclaimed academic publisher The Continuum. To address readers' feedback, we decided to combine the two versions into the present bilingual edition. The thought comes true with the blessings of the East China Normal University Press and its President, Ms. Wang Yan.

由于原来的英文本不是中文本的逐字对译，因此这次统成一本，我们在文字疏通和版面调整上下了不少功夫，使之读起来更像“对照”读物，便于读者在阅读过程中找到自己需要的东西。囿于时间，我们仅能在内容上作微小的调整和补充，增加了一些我们认为不得不增加的事件、观点等，例如历史发展进

程的补充、沈家煊的名动包含说。因为这不仅对于对比研究有意义，对于中国语言学建设乃至普通语言学研究也有意义。

The English version of 2007, though in many ways similar to the Chinese one, was not meant to be an exact English translation per se. Efforts have been made to rearrange and reformat the text and the wordings so that the two language versions run more or less “parallel” to the convenience of readers. In the interest of time, we have to live with minor revisions and supplements to include only some critical events, figures or viewpoints. Additions take into account a more complete picture of historical development as well as Shen Jiakuan’s Super-Noun Category Hypothesis. These are significant to the study of contrastive linguistics, and impactful on the grounding of Chinese linguistics and furthering general linguistics.

值此双语版出版，我们感激为当时中、英文版出版付出辛勤劳动的编校人员唐发铨、Jennifer Lovel, Rebecca Simmonds, Joanna Taylor, Judy Napper等，也感激这次双语版的特约审读汪燕和纪超然。

At the publication of the present bilingual edition, we remember the hard work put in by the editors of the previous monolingual versions Tang Fanao, Jennifer Lovel, Rebecca Simmonds, Joanna Taylor, Judy Napper among others, for their incredible patience and professionalism; we are of course greatly indebted to Wang Yan and Ji Chaoran, the editor of the present bilingual edition.

最后，中国对比语言学的领军人物之一、为本书撰写导论的杨自俭先生已于2009年辞世，他生前为此书的写作倾注过很多心血，他的精神一直激励着我们，谨以此书的双语出版作为本书作者对他最好的纪念！

Last but not least, this bilingual edition is dedicated to Professor Yang Zijian, a great champion in contrastive linguistics in China and author of the introduction to this book who passed away in 2009. Professor Yang had shaped and contributed to ideas in the course of writing and he will always be a constant inspiration to us. This book is a living tribute to his memory.

Pan Wenguo
Tham Wai Mun
November 2017



目录

CONTENTS

导论：对比语言学的新进展 / 1

第一章 西方对比语言学研究 / 35

- 1.1 越过拉多和沃尔夫 / 36
- 1.2 对比语言学起源与西方对比语言学史 / 39
- 1.3 第一期（19世纪20年代至20世纪40年代）：
对比哲学思想的奠基 / 52
- 1.4 第二期（20世纪40—70年代）：
在主流语言学理论转向中寻求立足点的开拓 / 87
- 1.5 第三期（1980年至今）：走向宏观和注重理论建构 / 111

第二章 中国对比研究简史（上） / 165

- 2.1 研究中国对比语言学史的意义 / 165
- 2.2 汉外对比研究发展史再探 / 196
- 2.3 第一期（1898—1921）：
比较与对比之间：《马氏文通》及其意义 / 197
- 2.4 第二期（1922—1955）：
旨在建立汉语自身语法体系的对比研究 / 224

导论：对比语言学的新发展

Introduction: Fresh Developments in Contrastive Linguistics

杨自俭 中国英汉语比较研究会会长

Yang Zijian President, China Association for Comparative
Studies Between English and Chinese

读了潘文国、谭慧敏的这本新作使我想起了1996年4月我为潘文国《汉英语对比纲要》写序的时候，现已近10年了。当时我正在筹备中国英汉语比较研究会第2次全国大会，想请徐通锵先生来会上讲讲汉语“字本位”问题，他因忙于修改《历史语言学》，没能成行。但文国为大会提交的两篇有重要理论价值的论文起到了补救作用，一篇讲对比语言学理论与学科体系问题，另一篇是《换一种眼光如何？——关于汉英对比研究的宏观思考》。就是这篇文章尖锐地批评了英汉对比研究和汉语研究都严重地依赖英语，以英律中，明确提出摆脱“印欧语的眼光”。他说从地道的汉语出发，就是“语言观和方法论的根本改观”，同时转述了徐通锵先生关于“字本位”和英语句子封闭性与汉语句子的开放性的思想，并指出只有从汉语出发才能使对比研究“达到真正的深度和广度”。后来我们学会讨论学科史和“两张皮”的问题，文国都带头做出了成绩。他在2000年第1期《语言研究》上刊载了长达27页的《汉语研究：世纪之交的思考》，2001年4月在青岛翻译学科建设专题讨论会上发表了史论结合的关于当代西方翻译学研究的长篇论文（《中国翻译》2002年1—3连载3期），同年10月在大连教授沙龙讲了“两张皮”的由来及对策，2002年第1期《世界汉语教学》刊登了他的又一篇长文（26页）《汉英对比研究一百年》，同年他还出版了专著《字本位与汉语研究》，《华东师范大学学报》2004年第3期

发表了他的《语言哲学与哲学语言学》。近期他在与谭慧敏合作完成这本著作的同时，还在和徐通锵先生共同主编“汉语字本位研究丛书”（暂定8本，详见徐通锵先生写的总序，载于《语言教学与研究》2005年第6期），并亲自撰写其中的《字本位和普通语言学》一书。另一方面，慧敏还在读大学本科时就对对比语言学感兴趣。作为班上的尖子学生，她以一篇关于汉语中的虚拟语气论文获得了荣誉学位。当时她还不是个语言学者，却已开始挑战汉语虚拟语气说的理论基础，无意中踏进了哲学语言学领域。在她关于汉语量词的硕士论文中，她从历史和微观的角度进行了深入的对比。后来她致力于机器翻译和中文计算语言学，尤其是董振东的知网模式，这激起了她对字本位理论和词汇语义学的思考。她与文国的学术背景完全不同，而在对比语言学理论探索方面居然想到一起去了，这也是件有趣的事情。我之所以罗列这些，主要想探讨：

（1）这些年他们，尤其是文国，在对比语言学这个领域所思考的问题、所做的研究、所追求的目标，也就是他们这本新作产生的基础和条件。（2）在此基础上总结一下他治学的道路和学科建设的经验。文国他们的这本新作的确做了许多创造性的研究，不论是中国的和西方的学科理论史的研究，还是对比语言学的本体论和方法论的探索，都提出了许多新的看法，可以说，这本新作的出版标志着国内外对比语言学理论建设和学科理论史研究进入了一个新的历史时期。我之所以有这样的认识主要基于我读后有几个感受很深的问题，现简述如下：

Reading this book, I cannot help recalling the time I penned a foreword for Wenguo's *Chinese-English Contrastive Study*. Let me invite you to travel ten years back with me to April 1996. At that time, the China Association for Comparative Studies Between English and Chinese (CACSEC) was occupied with organizing the second national conference for the Association, held at Qingdao Ocean University. Originally I wished Professor Xu Tongqiang (徐通锵) to share his thoughts on sinogram-based theory and issues; however, he was preoccupied with the revision of his work on *Historical Linguistics*. Fortunately, two other important papers by Wenguo filled the gap. One dealt with the theoretical construction and disciplinary system of contrastive linguistics; the other was entitled "How about changing a viewpoint?—Thoughts on the macro-perspectives of Chinese-English contrastive study". It is this paper that questions the prevailing emphasis on and imposition of the English rudiments that are common in English-Chinese contrastive studies as

in Chinese language studies. The paper has no reservations in its call for Chinese language studies to diverge from the shadowy “Indo-European viewpoint”: the new respect for the Chinese language would necessarily signify “a fundamental change in linguistic views and methodology”, in his words. In addition, the paper also relates the sinogram-based approach of Xu Tongqiang and discusses the closed nature of English sentence structures against the openness of the Chinese language to drive home the point that we will never achieve much in contrastive studies without taking a first step in studying Chinese in its own right and making that a basis for contrastive studies. Since 2000 Wenguo has again led the historical research of contrastive linguistics as well as the discussion of the “two-skin” phenomenon. *Yuyan Yanjiu (Language Review)* (2000: 1) contains his detailed retrospective study of the past century’s Chinese linguistics; *Zhongguo Fanyi (Journal of the Chinese Translator)* (2002: 1—3) carries three articles containing his survey of the Western translation theories from a historical perspective, presented at a national conference on translology in April 2001. In October 2001, he explained the origin of and discussed solutions to the “two-skin” phenomenon at the professorial salon held at Dalian; *Shijie Hanyu Jiaoxue (Teaching Chinese in the World)* (2002: 1) published, at length, his study of Chinese-English contrastive studies of the last century; also in 2002, his work *On Sinogram-based Chinese Studies* arrived on the shelves and the *Journal of East China Normal University* (2004: 3) included his Linguistic Philosophy and Philosophical Linguistics. As he prepares this book with Tham Wai Mun, he is at the same time co-editing with Xu Tongqiang a book series on sinogram-based Chinese language research (a planned-for eight books at this stage, with a series prefaced by Xu Tongqiang published in *Yuyan Jiaoxue yu Yanjiu (Language Teaching and Research)* (2005: 6) which he will write on sinogram-based approach and general linguistics. On the other hand, Wai Mun’s interest in contrastive studies was first aroused in her undergraduate days, when she was top of her class with a thesis that discusses the subjunctive mood in Chinese, leading to an honours degree. Not yet quite a linguistics student at that time, she began challenging the theoretical and typological grounds for the subjunctive mood in Chinese, totally unaware that she had unknowingly broken early into the territory of philosophical linguistics. In her master’s research on “quantifiers” in Chinese, Wai Mun delved

deep into the historical and micro-contrastive perspectives. Later, her involvement in machine translation and Chinese computational linguistics, particularly the How-net model by Dong Zhendong (董振东), excited more thoughts on sinogram-based theory and lexical semantics. Since they were not treading exactly the same research path, and particularly as they did not come from the same research background, it is even more interesting that the two should share similar scholastic thoughts. I mention these to illustrate the following. First, the foundation of the production of this book—all the pondering, research and pursuit on the part of the authors, particularly Wenguo. Second, I wish to summarize the research path of Wenguo and his experiences in constructing the contrastive linguistic discipline. As you read this book, you will find that it is full of creativity, filled with novel ideas, in terms of both the survey of the historical development path of the discipline in China and the West and the discussion on the ontology and methodology of contrastive linguistics. Be it within China or in the rest of the world, efforts in theoretical study, in particular theoretical development in contrastive linguistics, would, as I may safely put, now advance to the next milestone in history following the release of this benchmark volume. I base my argument on what struck me most deeply upon reading the draft, and which I may share only briefly below.

1. 立意高远

Far and deep insights

我之所以说此书立意高远，主要有以下四个方面的根据。

On account of the following grounds, I must say that the book is planned with a far-reaching foresight.

(1) 它把对比语言学看成是普通语言学的基础

Grounding general linguistics on contrastive linguistics

它挖掘和继承了西方洪堡特 (W. Von. Humboldt)、沃尔夫 (B. L. Whorf)、叶斯柏森 (O. Jespersen) 和中国赵元任、王力、吕叔湘、林语堂等人关于对比语言学和普通语言学关系的思想，比如洪堡特说：“从哲学观念上看，人们还几乎只是停留在普遍语法的贫乏境地。甚至对普遍语法，也极少视之为一门纯理性的科学，更未把它看作一种普遍的比较语法。”赵元任说：

“所谓语言学理论，实际上就是语言的比较，就是世界各民族语言综合比较研究得出的科学结论。”文国评论赵元任这句话说：“据我们所知，在洪堡特之后，中外语言学家中还没有一个人把语言对比提到这么高的地位的。这句话也成了1990年以后中国对比研究的主旋律，许多有成就的学者、有影响的著作都是本着这个精神来进行对比研究的。”其实文国他们这本书各部分都贯穿着这个精神：对比语言学的理论目标就是做普通语言学的支柱。

The work took pains in unearthing from both the East and the West on the relations between contrastive linguistics and general linguistics by such great linguists as Wilhelm von Humboldt, Benjamin Lee Whorf, Otto Jespersen, Chao Yuen-ren (赵元任), Wang Li (王力), Lü Shuxiang (吕叔湘) and Lin Yutang (林语堂). For example, Humboldt (1810-11: 7) remarks that: “From the philosophical perspective, people are still resting themselves on the poor state of universal grammar. They don't even regard universal grammar as a pure rational science, not to say to regard it as a universal comparative grammar.” Chao Yuen-ren concludes that: “Theoretical linguistics is in reality the comparing of languages, i.e. the scientific conclusion arises out of the consolidated comparison of ethnic languages in the world.” On this postulation, Wenguo says: “In so far as we know, no one else on Planet Earth apart from Humboldt has ever accorded such high status to contrastive study of languages. This remark of Chao was taken as the principle for China's contrastive studies after 1990.” That underpinning general linguistics is the theoretical goal of contrastive linguistics has been the ground upon which many prominent scholars have produced their works. It is that same spirit that runs throughout this work.

(2) 中国汉外对比研究的另一个目标是建立汉语自身的语言学

The alternative objective of Chinese-foreign-language contrastive studies in China: towards a real Chinese linguistics

马建忠、章炳麟、王国维、赵元任、李方桂、陈望道、罗常培、黎锦熙、王力、吕叔湘、高名凯、朱德熙、张志公等为代表的前辈语言学家，大都学了外语来研究汉语，为的是建立我们自己的汉语语言学，这是他们终生奋斗的目标。在古代世界上有三大语言研究中心，中国的训诂，希腊的语法，印度的音韵，各有特长。中国从先秦到1898年《马氏文通》出版在历史上形成了自己的语言学研究传统，即研究文字、训诂、音韵的小学传统。宋代晁公武（《郡

斋读书志》卷一)称小学为“文字之学”，这说明中国古代语言学以文字为研究对象，研究字形(文字学)、字义(训诂学)、字音(音韵学)，而不是以语言为研究对象，所以不研究语法。西方语言学以语言为研究对象，不重视研究文字，很重视研究语法。和西方语言学研究传统相比这两点就是我们语言研究传统的最突出的特点。《马氏文通》改变了这个传统。印欧语言学的理论引进来以后，特别在语法理论中引进了汉语中找不到恰当对应物的两个重要范畴：词(word)和句子(sentence)，还有其他一些语法范畴，比如性(gender)、数(number)、格(case)、时(tense)、体(aspect)、态(voice)、人称(person)、语气(mood)以及名(noun)、动(verb)、形(adjective)、代(pronoun)、副(adverb)、连(conjunction)、介(preposition)和主(subject)、谓(predicate)、宾(object)、表(predicative)、定(attributive)、状(adverbial)等等以后，我们的语言研究发生了重大变化，而且语法学成了最重要也是最主要的学科。所以《马氏文通》就成了中国现代语言学时期开端的标志。一个世纪过去了，我们积累了很多经验和教训，但大家都感到中与外的关系和古与今的关系都处理得不够好。文国分析说，中国古人的语言研究走的是另一条路，19世纪末我们急于学西方走富国强兵现代化之路，中国语言学家心怀民族振兴的重任，孜孜追求建立西方式的汉语语法体系，“这恐怕是他国的对比语言学家们所想象不到的。西方对比语言学的鼻祖们，即使是洪堡特、叶斯柏森和沃尔夫，大约也没有想到过对比语言学可以成为一个民族语言学建立的基础。”我们的语言研究在处理中与外、古与今之间的关系上存在什么问题呢？潘文国把这个问题放在普通语言学的观照下，先引证评述了洪堡特、高本汉(Bernhard karlgren)、叶斯柏森等对汉语特点的论述，后又引证评述了陈承泽、赵元任、黎锦熙、王力、吕叔湘、何容、高名凯、张志公、徐通锵等人的思想观念与困惑，得出结论说汉语和印欧语是两大不同类型的语言，其本质差别在于语义和语法形式的关系不同，也就是有没有“形态”，汉语没有印欧语词类和句法那样对应的关系。张志公说“印欧语都是形态语……汉语本身是‘非形态语言’。形态语和非形态语是明显不同的两种语言体系，我们应当理直气壮、明白无误地确认汉语‘非形态’这一事实，从而有勇气打破印欧语的语法框架，探索和建立汉语自己的语法体系。”(1990年)潘文国说：“否定‘形态说’和否定‘词’的概念是语言对比研究带有全局性的大问题，牵一发而动全身，对普通语言学理论是个相当大的冲击。”他分析了研究汉语的9类学者之后说：“我们有必要研究中

国的汉外对比发展史，从中来观察汉语研究和中国普通语言学研究的真正进展。”汉语的研究必须走中外和古今两个结合的道路，中国语言学百年历史证明，中断自己的传统、跟着外国的理论转是没有出路的。

That forerunners such as Ma Jianzhong (马建忠), Zhang Binglin (章炳麟), Wang Guowei (王国维), Chao Yuen-ren, Li Fanggui (李方桂), Chen Wangdao (陈望道), Luo Changpei (罗常培), Li Jinxi (黎锦熙), Wang Li, Lü Shuxiang, Gao Mingkai (高名凯), Zhu Dexi (朱德熙) and Zhang Zhigong (张志公) chose to learn foreign language(s), they did it for an ultimate aim harboured for Chinese-language research. They were truly bilinguals or multilinguals having a lifelong commitment to the construction of a linguistic system true to the Chinese language. Far back in those old days, there were three centres of linguistic research: in China, exegesis (训诂); in Greece, grammar and in India, phonology. Each specializes in a field. Spanning from pre-Qin to the release of *Mashi Wentong* (Ma's grammar) in 1898, the Chinese have long shaped and owned a tradition of philology that was termed "primary learning" (小学), involving the graphical and etymological study of sinograms (文字学), phonology and phonetics (音韵学) and exegetic semantics (训诂学). Chao Gongwu (晁公武) of the Song Dynasty defines "primary learning" as the study about sinograms. (*Jun Zhai Du Shu Zhi* 《郡斋读书志》 vol. 1). In itself, the definition is illustrative of the nature of linguistic studies in ancient China, which focuses on the various aspects of sinograms, or Chinese characters, as the pictography (字形) or the science of sinogram construction; the meaning as well as the sound or phonology and prosody. Clearly, language *per se* never falls within the research scope, so, as such, grammar has no place. Western linguistics, on the other hand, looks at language itself instead of the writing signs, so grammar is important. We thus see that the outstanding characteristics of the linguistics tradition of the Chinese are different from those of the West. *Mashi Wentong* twisted this course of tradition. The introduction of Indo-European linguistic theories introduces, in particular, two significant grammatical categories that have no equivalent in Chinese: word and sentence, following a string of other categories such as gender, number, case, tense, aspect, voice, person, mood, noun, verb, adjective, pronoun, adverb, conjunction, preposition, subject, predicate, object, predicative, attributive, adverbial, and so on. Armed with the new tool, linguistic research in China took a

major shift, with grammar becoming the star discipline. We could well attribute the formation of modern linguistics in China to *Mashi Wentong*. One century has passed, and enough experiences drawn and lessons learnt. And the concerns have been the proper integration of the Chinese and foreign linguistic traditions as well as the proper inheritance of past linguistic legacy within modern Chinese. In this light, the authors shared and evaluated the path taken by Chinese linguists of the nineteenth century. Chinese intellectuals, mindful of their mission to empower China with tools that will lead the country to modernization signified by military might and economic strength, have wasted no time in taking their cue from the West. Shouldering the task of revitalizing the Chinese ethnicity, linguists at the time looked hard to establish a Chinese linguistic system based on the Western model. "It would never occur to any linguist in the world that a linguistic discipline in contrastive studies could be tied to the fate of the nation, not even Humboldt or Jespersen or Whorf could ever imagine laying foundation of linguistics for a nation through contrastive linguistics." (Chapter 2). What are the issues concerning our handling of tradition and current development, and the way we manage Chinese and foreign linguistic systems? Guided by general linguistics, the authors discuss the above questions with illustrative quotations, first from Humboldt, Karlgren and Jespersen on their views of the characteristics of the Chinese language, and further from Chen Chengze (陈承泽), Chao Yuen-ren, Li Jinxi, Wang Li, L Shuxiang, He Rong (何容), Gao Mingkai, Zhang Zhigong and Xu Tongqiang of their perceptions and perplexities. The conclusion distinguishes the typology of Chinese and Indo-European languages, as evident in how semantic and grammatical forms are connected, which boils down to the existence of "morphology". One does not find the kind of mapping word classes and sentence patterns of Indo-European languages in the Chinese language. Zhang Zhigong remarked that Indo-European languages are morphological languages... whereas the Chinese language is a "non-morphological language. Obviously, morphological and non-morphological languages are two systems of language. We shall confidently and unequivocally uphold the fact that Chinese is non-morphological, only then do we have the courage to break free from the grammatical frame of the Indo-European languages in search of a grammatical system genuine to Chinese." (1990) The authors warn: "The dismissal of morphology and the concept