

韵律语法研究

Studies in Prosodic Grammar

第二辑

Volume 2

2017年第1期 (No.1 2017)

主编 冯胜利



北京语言大学出版社

BEIJING LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

韵律语法研究

Studies in Prosodic Grammar

第二辑

Volume 2

2017年第1期 (No.1 2017)

主编 冯胜利



北京语言大学出版社

BEIJING LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 2017 北京语言大学出版社, 社图号 17077

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

韵律语法研究. 第二辑, 2017 年. 第 1 期 / 冯胜利主编. — 北京: 北京语言大学出版社, 2017.5

ISBN 978-7-5619-4894-1

I. ①韵… II. ①冯… III. ①汉语—韵律(语言)—研究—现代 ②汉语—语法—研究—现代 IV. ① H116.4 ② H14

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2017) 第 117468 号

韵律语法研究

YUNLÜ YUFA YANJIU

排版制作: 北京创艺涵文化发展有限公司

责任印制: 包 朔

出版发行: 北京语言大学出版社

社 址: 北京市海淀区学院路 15 号, 100083

网 址: www.blcup.com

电子信箱: service@blcup.com

电 话: 编辑部 8610-82300207

国内发行 8610-82303650/3591/3648

海外发行 8610-82303365/3080/3668

北语书店 8610-82303653

网购咨询 8610-82303908

印 刷: 北京九州迅驰传媒文化有限公司

版 次: 2017 年 5 月第 1 版 印 次: 2017 年 5 月第 1 次印刷

开 本: 787 毫米 × 1092 毫米 1/16 印 张: 11.25

字 数: 213 千字

定 价: 45.00 元

PRINTED IN CHINA

《韵律语法研究》编委会

Editorial Board of *Studies in Prosodic Grammar*

主 编 冯胜利

(Chief Editor)

编 委 (按姓名音序排列)

(Editorial Board Members)

蔡维天

陈曙东

Downing, Laura

端木三

冯 蒸

黄正德

马秋武

沈家煊

施向东

Simpson, Andrew

张 健

赵敏俐

郑礼珊

Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa

编辑部成员 (按姓名音序排列)

(Editors)

黄 梅 裴雨来 王丽娟 庄会彬

前 言

这是《韵律研究》的第二辑，现在如期和大家见面了。《韵律研究》今更名为《韵律语法研究》。韵律语法是一个新兴领域。首先，这里“语法”一词指的是“语言的法则”，而不单单是“句法”一个方面。其次，它的“新”还表现在它以当代韵律学的核心思想（相对轻重论）为基础，以汉语语法现象为对象来发掘人类语言的普适规则。因此，从本辑开始，韵律语法的研究不仅一如既往地关注韵律学、韵律构词学、韵律句法学的研究，同时对其他与韵律相关的语法现象，也给予关注和研究，如韵律诗体学、韵律语体学、韵律文学、韵律的习得与教学，等等。

读者可以从第一辑、本辑以及将来刊出的文章里看到：不仅大量的汉语韵律语法现象被发掘出来，普通语言学很多有价值的语言学原理也一批批地破土而出。正因为它新，所以它才日新月异、突飞猛进地发展，近年来的发展是如此，将来的发展，可以想象，更是如此。

韵律语法也是一个中国传统学者千百年来关注和关心的对象和领域，尽管那时还没有形成理论，还没有系统的方法和可供承传的推演公式和理论构架。然而，他们都对音律（meter, rhyme, melody, metrics）有着细密的观察、切身的体验和精深的见解。因此，规律往往自然而然地出没于他们的口中，流到他们的笔下。沈约（441—513）就说过：“欲使宫羽相变，低昂舛节；若前有浮声，则后须切响。一简之内，音韵尽殊；两句之中，轻重悉异。”（见《宋书·谢灵运传论》），这可谓中国韵律学的先声——韵律的很多语音现象均已提到。当然，我们先人创造的和富有的尚属砖瓦和器材，而今天的学术已经发展到关注世界万千语言的核心内质。显然，以前那种就事论事、作坊手艺式的研究，已不堪其用；大眼界、大胸怀、大理论的框架研究刻不容缓。韵律语法研究正是应此运而生的时代产物。

不可忽略的是，韵律语法是中国语言学继承传统、结合西学发展出来的

语言学的一个分支。国外没有韵律句法学^①(Prosodic Syntax),普通语言学也没有韵律语体学(Prosodic Register)。国际上,韵律与文学的研究尚未结合语言的发展揭示文学形式时代更替中的韵律脉络,从而有望构成一个将来可以独立成科的“韵律文学发展史”。具体而言,国外恐怕没有哪家语言学刊物将文学的研究列为自己的专栏。然而,上述诸方面发展正是《韵律语法研究》的一大特点:韵律文学是它的一个重要领域。《韵律语法研究》所关注的“语法”不仅包括口语语法和正式语体语法,其他方面的语法,如骈散之法、文笔之法、诗词之法、诵读之法等不同类型的文学语言的形式法则,均在韵律语法的研究之列。我们知道,古今控制韵律的基本原则是恒定不变的(凡事均有万变不离之宗),但是,其表现形式则或因一发之牵而撼动全身。

韵律语法因而具有鲜明的民族特色。其民族性就表现在它构建理论、发掘现象时所体现出的当代概念的传统启示和当代方法的传统理念。相对轻重论是 Mark Liberman 革命性的创获,而唯有切感沈约的“宫羽相变,低昂舛节”(=字调和语调)、“前有浮声,则后须切响”(=平仄或长短)、“音韵尽殊……轻重悉异”(=音段和超音段),才能真正理解 Liberman 的深意所在。韵律构词学(Prosodic Morphology)是 John McCarthy 和 Alan Prince 的发明,然而没有根植于“开开 vs 开开”的语感内功^②,无法创造国外没有的 Morphological Prosody^③。

学者评论韵律语法说:“汉语形式语法研究的另一个重要领域是韵律语法。将韵律看作一种制约语法结构规则的形式,是近二十年来汉语语法研究的重要发展。”^④形式语法的基本原理是理性主义(Rationalism),而韵律语法的理性原理还进而根植于乾嘉的“理必”(即道理上的而不是材料上的必然)^⑤。韵律语法既不是民族化的西方理论,也不是西方化的民族理论。究竟为何,将

① 国外的音系—句法界面研究还主要在 TP 范域的韵律和句法的互动,没有 CP-TP-VP 之间的互动研究和理论。

② 参见陆宗达、俞敏,《现代汉语语法》,北京:中华书局,2016。

③ 参见王丽娟,《汉语的韵律形态》,北京:北京语言大学出版社,2015。

④ 引自李宇明主编,《1949—2015 当代中国语言学研究》,北京:中国社会科学出版社,2016:199。

⑤ 这里的“理必”可从戴震(1724—1777)“《尧典》古本必有作‘横被四表’者”的推断中见其一斑。详论参见冯胜利《乾嘉“理必”与语言研究的科学属性》,载于《中文学术前沿》(第九辑),杭州:浙江大学出版社,2015:99~117。

来的学术史评断自有公论，而我们的目标是始终不变的：用西方学术的精华发现自己传统的精奥，用自己传统的精华揭示西方理论的高深——在这样的理念指导下去审视、发现和解决我们关注的现象和事实。韵律语法的出现是东西学术结合的产物，韵律语法的将来同样还走东西理论兼合的道路。因此，我们关注和研究的对象不仅包括普通语言学问题，如：什么是韵律？什么是节律？什么是音步？什么是韵律词？CP-/TP-/VP-Prosody有何不同及如何互动？语言的声调为什么与其（句末）语气词相对应？等等。我们更关注汉语本身的韵律语法问题，如：历史上为什么上古有韵素音步而后代逐渐消失殆尽？为什么古无上、去同时也无句末语气词？为什么声调发展和双音化并肩而行？为什么双音化在两汉突然暴增？文笔之分为什么在中古发生？四六之文为什么始于魏晋？诗可吟，文可诵，吟诵之别的韵律原理是什么？古文为什么要“哼”而不能“念”？^①节律音系学上，如何判断有人说“车辚辚，马萧萧，行人弓箭各在腰”的3+3+4是外来节律？如何判断有人说北京话的“我们的”的重轻轻取自蒙古语的格式？不仅如此，语体语法上，为什么音足调实的音节和轻音轻读的音节有语体之差？为什么汉语的单双音节的对立，英文的拉丁根词汇和安格鲁-萨克森词汇的对立，都有“短长对雅俗”的韵律语体对应性？而更富有挑战性的是胡乔木1981年6月12日致信赵元任的问题：

中国诗歌何以由诗经楚辞的偶数字句型为主变为两汉以后的奇数字句型为主？偶数字句诗除辞赋体外，六言诗始终不流行，八言诗根本没有（当然不算新诗），奇数字句诗基本上也只限于五七言（不包括词曲），在民歌中大多数是七言。新诗出现以后，情况再变，基本上以偶数字句型为主，而且一般句子的字数也多在八言以上（这里没有考虑自由诗）。^②

他怀疑“是否古汉语的发展在此期间出现了某种重要变化？”今天我们知道，古汉语在两汉以前是综合型语言，两汉以后发生了类型性变化，变成分析型语言。显然，语言类型的变化给我们解释文学形式的改变打开了一个崭新的

① 参见朱光潜，《散文的声音节奏》，载于《谈文学》，北京：北京大学出版社，2013。

② 引自吴宗济，《吴宗济语言学论文集》，北京：商务印书馆，2004：246。

窗口。窗口虽然打开，但是精彩的美景尚未尽收眼底，绚丽的图画还没绘制出来。《韵律语法研究》就是给有志于解决上述疑案、揭示上述谜底、绘制上述图画的人，提供一个创新平台——让我们从韵律这个窗口，看到汉语的昨天，看到汉语的今天，看到汉语的方言，看到汉语的文学和语体。正因如此，“韵律研究”的目标就扩大到了“韵律语法研究”的范围；而北京语言大学出版社的鼎力支持，更让我们坚定了韵律语法研究的信心，努力把这个新兴的领域向前推进。这里，让我们再次引用本刊编委、著名语言学家 Andrew Simpson 评论汉语韵律语法的话，作为我们刊物为之奋斗的目标：

将来的韵律与语法的相互作用的研究，无论是跨方言的共时研究，还是历时的研究（这是可能的），都是未来汉语语言学研究中的一个丰富而内容充实的领域，是一个汉语可以为有关人类语言的普通语言学理论做出重要贡献的领域。^①

① 引自 *The Handbook of Chinese Linguistics*. Willey Blackwell. Chichester, UK. 2014: 465-492.

Preface

The second issue of *Prosodic Studies* is published as scheduled. *Prosodic Studies* has now officially been renamed as *Studies in Prosodic Grammar*, and the reasons are as follows: Starting from this issue, we not only welcome research that pays attention to Prosodic Phonology, Prosodic Morphology, and Prosodic Syntax as usual, but also attach importance to all the grammatical phenomena related to prosody, such as Poetic Prosody, Prosodic Register, Prosodic Literature, the Acquisition and Teaching of Prosody, etc.

Prosodic Grammar is an emerging field. First of all, the word “grammar” refers to the “rules of language” other than just the aspect of syntax. Secondly, it aims to explore the universal rules of human language with the core concept of contemporary Prosodic Phonology (cf. Relative Prominence) as its foundation and the Chinese language as its object of study. Readers can see from the articles in the first issue, the current one, and the future issues in which not only a large number of Chinese prosodic grammatical phenomena have been (and will have been) explored, but many linguistic principles which merits attention from general linguistics are emerging. Prosodic Grammar is ever-changing and developing rapidly as a new research field. Judging from its development trend in recent years, it can be predicted that this field will develop even faster in the future.

Prosodic Grammar is also a field that has attracted much attention among traditional Chinese scholars for almost a thousand of years. Although there was no theory, no systematic approach, and no available deduction formula or theoretical framework at that time, they had their firsthand experience, a meticulous observation and deep insight into meter, rhyme, melody, and metrics. Therefore, reflections/observations on rules of rhythm often presented themselves naturally in commentaries and writings. Shen Yue (441-513) said “we should make characters of different tonal patterns alternate with each other and ensure that the poetic couplet thus formed emerge in a relatively prominent manner. If the first line of the couplet contains characters of the level tone, then the second line must have characters of the non-level tone. The five characters of each line should differentiate one from another in terms of their phonological features and the two lines must have completely different stress patterns.” (*Biographies and Commentaries of Xie Lingyun from Songshu*). This can be viewed as the predecessor of Chinese prosodic studies, because many prosodic phenomena have been mentioned. Without doubt, what our ancestors have created and possessed were still preliminary, while today’s academic development has focused on the universal properties of languages. Of little use has been the craftsmanship of investigating phenomena for their

own sake; to develop a framework with great vision, broad mind and scientific theory brooks no further delay. Therefore, *Studies in Prosodic Grammar* emerges as the times require.

It cannot be ignored that Prosodic Grammar is a branch of linguistics that has been developed by inheriting Chinese linguistic traditions and learning from Western linguistics. There is neither Prosodic Syntax in Western countries nor Prosodic Register in general linguistics. Internationally, the study of prosody and literature has not combined with the evolution of language yet so as to reveal the course of change in prosody in relation to the evolvement of literary forms, which is expected to form an independent discipline of "History of Prosodic Literature" in the future. A specific manifestation of this is the fact that there is perhaps no linguistic journal abroad that includes literary research in its own column. However, *Studies in Prosodic Grammar* fills the gap, and Prosodic Literature is an important area of the journal. The "grammar" that the journal focuses on not only includes grammar of spoken language and formal grammar, but also other forms and rules of different types of literary language, such as the rules of parallel prose, verse and prose, and reading and chanting, etc. We know that the basic principles underlying prosody are constant, but, a slight difference in their applications may affect the situation as a whole.

Prosodic Grammar thus has a distinctive Chinese origin. Its Chinese characteristics is reflected in the process of constructing the theory and exploring the phenomenon: contemporary concepts are derived by drawing on traditional revelation, and contemporary methods are employed with the awareness of traditional ideas. The theory of Relative Prominence is Mark Liberman's revolutionary discovery, and only by a thorough understanding of Shen Yue's statement of "we should make characters of different tonal patterns alternate with each other and ensure that the poetic couplet thus formed emerge in a relatively prominent manner," and "the five characters of each line should differentiate one from another in terms of their phonological features and the two lines must have completely different stress patterns," can one fully understand what Liberman really drives at. Prosodic Morphology is the invention of John McCarthy and Alan Prince, and by referring to this theory and relying on our perfect sense of language for examples like "**ka**kai (to bubble up, the first syllable *kai* is stressed within the verb reduplication) vs. kai**ka**i (boiling water, the second syllable is stressed within the adjective reduplication)" (Lu Zongda & Yu Min, 2016)^①, Morphological Prosody is newly developed in Chinese and in general linguistics as well.^②

Scholars have remarked that Prosodic Grammar constitutes one of the important areas of Chinese formal linguistics^③. The fundamental of formal linguistics lies in the Rationalism, while Prosodic Grammar bases itself not only on this philosophical idea,

① See *Modern Chinese Grammar* by Lu Zongda and Yu Min. Zhonghua Book Company, 2016.

② See *The Prosodic Form in Chinese* by Wang Lijuan. Beijing Language and Culture University Press, 2015.

③ See *Studies in Contemporary Chinese Linguistics (1949-2015)* edited by Li Yuming. 2016: 199.

but also the Reason-based Approaches held by the scholars of the Qian-Jia Era of the Qing Dynasty^① (which prioritizes the certainty in logical principles over that in collected materials). Prosodic Grammar is neither a sinicization of Western linguistic theories nor a Westernization of Chinese linguistic theories. Its goal is to discover the profound ideas of traditional Chinese academics and to reveal the profoundness of Western theories with the essence of traditional Chinese insights. In a word, it is under such guidance and direction that we have made our discoveries and accounted for the facts. The emergence of Prosodic Grammar is the product of the combination of the Eastern and Western academics, and the future research of this field will move forward unswervingly along this road. Therefore, the objects of our attention and research include not only those in general linguistics, such as: What is prosody? What is rhythm? What is a foot? What is a prosodic word? What is the difference among CP-/TP-/VP-Prosody and how do they interact? Why does the tone of the language correspond to its (sentence final) particle? etc. Of more interest to us are the prosodic matters of the Chinese language, such as: Why did the moraic foot in ancient times gradually disappear? Why were there no tone-3 (rising) and tone-4 (falling) together with the lack of sentence final particles in Archaic Chinese? Why did tone development and disyllabification occur at about the same time? Why did disyllabification suddenly rise in the Western Han and Eastern Han dynasties? Why did the distinction between verse and prose occur in the Middle Chinese? Why did the “Four-Six Parallel Prose” start in the Wei-Jin Periods? Since poems are to be chanted and proses recited, what are the prosodic principles of chant and recitation? Why should we “hum” the ancient Chinese proses but not “read” them?^② Why do we say that the “3+3+4” rhythm in “The vehicles were rumbling, the war horses were neighing, and the soldiers have put their bows and arrows on the waist” (a verse line in Du Fu’s poem *Chariots March* 兵车行) is a loan rhythm form in terms of its prosody? How do we say that the “stressed-unstressed-unstressed” pattern of “*wo men de*” in Beijing dialect is taken from the Mongolian language? Moreover, why are there stylistic differences between stressed syllables and unstressed syllables from the perspective of Register (Stylistic) Grammar? Why is there a prosodic stylistic correspondence between “syllabic length and stylistic elevation”, as exemplified by the monosyllable-disyllable contrast in Chinese and the “contrast between words of Latin origin and words of Anglo-Saxon origin” in English? And more challenging questions were raised by Hu Qiaomu in his letter to Chao Yuan Ren on June 12, 1981:

① The “certainty of reason” is described in the inference of “heng pi si biao 横被四表” made by Dai Zhen (1724-1777) in “The Classics of Emperor Yao.” For more details, see “The ‘Certainty of Reason’ Raised by the Scholars During the Reigns of Emperor Qianlong and Emperor Jiaqing of the Qing Dynasty and the Scientific Nature of Language Research” by Feng Shengli. *Chinese Frontier of Language and Literature*, 2015(9): 99-117.

② See Zhu Guangqian (2013) The prosaic rhythm. In *Essays on Literature*. Beijing: Peking University Press.

How did Chinese poetry change from even-numbered characters (syllables) in each line, such as in the Book of Songs and the Poetry of Chu, into odd-numbered characters (syllables) after the Western Han and Eastern Han dynasties? As for poems of even-numbered characters in each line, except for the proses, the classical poems with six characters in each line were always not popular, and there were no poems with eight characters in each line at all (excluding modern new poetry). As for the poetries of even-numbered characters in each line, there were basically limited to poems with five or seven characters in each line (excluding the lyrics of Ci and Qu), and most of the folk songs have seven characters in each line. After the emergence of the modern new poetry, the situation changed again. Poems of even-numbered characters in each line are in the majority, and most lines have eight or more characters (free verses are not taken into consideration).^①

He wondered “whether Ancient Chinese during this period has gone through any crucial changes.” Today we know that Archaic Chinese was a synthetic language before the Western Han and Eastern Han dynasties. Then, it evolved into an analytical language. Obviously, the typological change opened a new window for us to explain the change in the form of literature. Although the window has been open, the panoramic view is yet to be appreciated, and the brilliant picture to be painted. Therefore, *Studies in Prosodic Grammar* is to provide an innovative platform for people who are determined to solve the above mysteries, find the answers and draw the picture. It also offers us the window of prosody to observe the Chinese language — its past and present, its dialects, its literary forms and its registers.

Starting from this issue, the goal of the former *Prosodic Studies* has been extended to what *Studies in Prosodic Grammar* is devoted to explore. Moreover, the strong support from Beijing Language and Culture University Press has reaffirmed our confidence in the studies of prosodic grammar to promote the development of the emerging field. Here, we would like to conclude by quoting once again the comments of Andrew Simpson, the distinguished linguist and member of the editorial board, on Chinese prosodic grammar, which is the goal of the journal:

“The continued study of prosody and syntax interactions, both synchronically across different varieties of Chinese and diachronically (where this is possible), promises to be a rich and very informative area of future research for Chinese linguistics, and one in which Chinese can contribute importantly to general theories of human language.”^②

① See *A Collection of Linguistic Essays* by Wu Zongji, The Commercial Press, 2004: 246.

② See *The Handbook of Chinese Linguistics*. Willey Blackwell. Chichester, UK. 2014: 465-492.

目 录

汉语中的轻语类和双系式移位	张 冲 Larson, Richard	1
---------------------	---------------------	---

汉语方言与古音中的韵律表现	郑张尚芳	28
---------------------	------	----

汉语语调焦点重音的韵律实现方式与类型	马秋武	32
--------------------------	-----	----

韵律句法交互作用下的汉语非典型疑问词研究

——以“V 什么 (V)/(NP)”中的“什么”为例	汪昌松	73
----------------------------------	-----	----

韵律对汉语致使结构谓语的制约	王 迟	101
----------------------	-----	-----

“险韵”新论	张 健	136
--------------	-----	-----

现代汉语书面语研究的前沿之作

——简评孙德金《现代书面汉语中的文言语法成分研究》

.....	黄 梅 裴雨来	146
-------	---------	-----

第三届汉语韵律语法研究国际研讨会 2016 年在北京语言大学召开		157
--	--	-----

第三届汉语韵律语法研究国际研讨会发言者与题目		158
------------------------------	--	-----

CONTENTS

Light Heads and Applicative Shift in Mandarin

..... Zhang Chong & Larson, Richard 1

The Prosodic Features in Chinese Dialects and Archaic Chinese Pronunciation

..... Zhengzhang Shangfang 28

The Focus Accents in Chinese Intonation: Prosodic Implementation and Types

..... Ma Qiuwu 32

A Study on Noncanonical *Wh*-Particles from the Prosody-Syntax Interface

—A Case Study of “Shenme” in “V ‘Shenme’ (V)/(NP)” Construction

..... Wang Changsong 73

Prosodic Constraints on the Predicate Verbs of Causative Constructions in Mandarin

Chinese Wang Chi 101

A New Perspective on “Perilous Rhyme” Zhang Jian 136

A Pioneer Study in the Field of Modern Written Chinese

—A Review on *Research on Literary Grammar in Modern Written Chinese* by Sun

Dejin Huang Mei & Pei Yulai 146

汉语中的轻语类和双系式移位

张 冲 Larson, Richard

摘 要 语言通过两种不同的形式可以表达一系列广泛的含义，也就是双系式和旁格式。双系式包含动词（v/V）的投射，常常有句法形态标记（-appl）。旁格式通常以介词短语的形式出现。

双系式

旁格

形式： α 动词 -appl β γ α 动词 γ [介词 β]

含义：造成领属关系，受益/受害/替代关系，工具；造成移动/移位，刺激，方式，理由

有的语言倾向于使用旁格形式（例如英语），有的语言倾向于使用双系式形式（例如伊博语），有的语言可以在两者之间比较自由地转换（例如卢旺达语）。这两种形式之间的句法关系——派生还是不同的中心语投射——存在争议。本文认为汉语的动词短语（vP/VP）属于双系式结构。具体来说，一系列汉语结构（包括双宾语、非典型宾语）都是双系式。我们在 Larson（2014）的投射理论框架之下提出分析。此理论将题元角色分析成形式化的句法题元特征，题元角色的分配由题元特征之间核查一致关系来实现。我们也讨论了这个分析方法的语义解释，以及它和选择之间的联系。后者与其他轻动词的分析有重要区别。

关键词 汉语 双系式移位 题元特征的一致关系

在世界上的各种语言中,有两种形式被广泛地用来表达一系列含义。第一种是包含动词(v/V)投射的双系式形式(applicative form),在句法上它常常有一个特殊的形态学标记(-appl);第二种是不包含动词投射的旁格形式(oblique form),它通常以介词短语的形式出现。这两种形式的例子见(1):

(1) 双系式 旁格
形式: α 动词 -appl β γ α 动词 γ [介词 β]

含义: 造成领属关系, 受益/受害/替代关系, 工具; 造成移动/移位, 刺激, 方式, 理由

不同的语言在这个问题上的表现形式也不同: 有的语言倾向于使用旁格形式(例如英语), 有的语言倾向于使用双系式形式(例如伊博语), 有的语言可以在两者之间比较自由地转换(例如卢旺达语)。然而, 这两种形式究竟是通过句法结构派生转换而来的, 还是通过不同的中心语投射而来的, 学界目前还没有统一的定论。

本文讨论此问题在汉语中的表现。在第1节中, 我们将汉语中的旁格论元(oblique arguments)分成单及物结构(monotransitives)和双及物结构(ditransitives)。其中单及物结构在汉语和英语中的区别很大, 而双及物结构在汉语和英语中的区别不大。在第2节中, 我们介绍Larson在2014年提出的理论。此理论认为题元角色(θ -roles)是一种在句法上被形式化了的题元特征(θ -features), 而题元角色的分配(assignment)是通过核查题元特征的一致关系(agreement)来实现的。此理论也为结构投射(structure projection)和论元倒置(argument inversion)提供了解释。在第3节中, 我们回到对汉语中旁格论元的讨论, 并且提出它们应该被统一分析成双系式宾语(applied objects), 句法上从旁格的位置移动而来。在第4节中, 我们进行总结, 并且简要地讨论这个分析的语义解释以及它同选择(selection)的联系。

1. 汉语中的旁格论元

1.1 单及物结构

Lin (2001) 提出了以下范式, 见(2)。(2)a 含有一个典型的受事宾语, 而

(2)b~d 含有不典型的宾语类型。这些宾语携带的旁格题元角色分别是工具、地点、时间。

(2) a. 我吃牛肉面。

b. 我吃大碗。

c. 我吃馆子。

d. 我吃下午。

如同之后的许多学者注意到的 (Ren Zhang, 2005; Audrey Li, 2011, 2014; Barrie & Audrey Li, 2014), 尽管 (2)a~d 中黑体带下画线的部分在语义上和情景副词 (circumstantial adverbs) 相似, 在句法分布上它们却和直接宾语相似。例如: 它们和动词之间由体标记 (aspect) 分开并且不能组并 (incorporate), 见 (3)a; 它们可以和长度/频率短语同现, 见 (3)b; 它们可以出现在“动词+受影响的宾语”之后, 见 (3)c; 它们可以被关系从句化, 见 (3)d。

(3) a. 他画过那面墙。

b. 我上星期吃了三次/天面/饭店。

c. 我就画了他三张纸。

d. 他吃的 (餐厅) 都是豪华餐厅。

如果句子中有典型的施事或者感事论元做主语, 非典型宾语看起来似乎在与典型宾语“竞争”, 以至于它们不能共现。参见 (2)a~d 和 (4)a~e。

(4) a. *我吃大碗牛肉面。^①

b. *我吃馆子牛肉面。

c. *我吃下午牛肉面。

d. *我吃下午馆子。

e. *我吃下午馆子大碗牛肉面。

有意思的是, 如果句子中没有典型主语, 那就具有了更多的可能性。典型宾语和非典型宾语都可以被“推出”到主语的位置。Li (2014) 提供了 (5)~(8) 这样的例子, 注意其中论元的顺序可以颠倒。

① 此处“大碗”不是“牛肉面”的定语, 而是非典型宾语。它的题元角色为工具。