摘　要

　　双及物结构是语言类型学研究的一个重要课题，它指有一个施事、一个"接事" R 和一个"客事" T 的结构（见 Croft，2003：142-4，152-4；陆丙甫等，2009），最典型的双及物结构含一个客观转移（physical transfer）义动词，如"给"、"租"、"递"、"卖"、"还"（Malchukov et al.，2010：1-2）。跨语言的双及物结构还表征纯致使移动事件（含目标 G）、致使受益事件（含受益者 B）和逆向夺取类事件（含来源 Sc）。以上 4 类典型事件我们称为双及物事件。

　　以往的类型学双及物事件编码研究（Malchukov et al.，2010；Heine et al.，2010；等等）多关注跨语言共性，几乎没有关注区域共性的。Michaelis et al.（2003）虽然涉及到区域共性，但其是基于 WALS 105A（http://wals.info/chapter/105）的采样，即只采样了"给"字双及物结构。本文通过我们自己的样本以及分析证明了"给"是非典型的双及物动词，通过对它抽象出的编码共性是不可靠的。由此看来，全面的双及物事件编码区域共性研究尚缺乏。本文选择东南亚区域的上百种语言作为研究范围。在类型学参项设定上本文也更为多样，有表层形式、论元（Ɵ）凸显模式 2 个形式参项，O-V、T-{R}相对语序、论元—核心动词（Ɵ-V）相对语序 3 个语序参项，以及语义角色 1 个语义参项。

　　本文通过对东南亚区域 152 种语言的双及物事件编码的类型学分析发现东南亚 V3 语言倾向于用附属语标注结构编码，V2 语言倾向于用连动式和附属语标注结构编码。排除双宾构式，V2 语言的双及物事件线性编码深受时序原则 / 顺序像似性原则的制约，而 V3 语言无此倾向性，RT 和 TR 语序均可。另外，本区域内 VRT 双宾构式较 VTR 双宾构式更强势，双宾构式本身是一种高度构式化的结构。"[T>R]连动式"即 VTVR 和 TVRV 连动式极为强势；同时，核心语标注结构相当鲜见。

　　本区域内两类广义句法形态即表层形式与Ɵ凸显模式的功能是互补的。Ɵ–V相对语序和 T-{R}相对语序功能互补，都起到解歧的作用。Ɵ凸显模式与语序无关，而表层形式与语序负相关（即功能互补）。也就是说，当表层形式的解歧功能较强时（即为附置词结构时），语序的解歧功能最弱。而当表层形式的解歧功

能较弱时（即为双宾结构时），语序的解歧功能最强。正因为语序在双宾结构中的这种补充解歧功能，催生了高度构式化的双宾构式。除了附置词结构、双宾构式和连动式这三类高频表层形式之外，低频表层形式的语序偏向都与特殊的谱系发生关联。

如果要讨论区域共性，就必须先证明其是否存在。本文通过与跨语言共性对比、与谱系上各语群个性对比，证明了上述这些区域共性都不是由跨语言共性和谱系遗传造成的，即双及物事件编码的东南亚区域共性是存在的。

就特殊动词而言，"给"是非典型的三价动词，将其作为典型动词来研究双及物事件编码类型时需要格外注意。另一类是言说动词，由于遵循重成分后置原则，言说动词附带的小句 T 总位于 R 后。

对这些共性如何形成的原因，本文提出，由四种结构、语用或在线处理方面的动因驱动了东南亚语言优先选择符合某些普遍原则的编码形式。它们是"可别度领前"原则（陆丙甫，2005a，2005b，2009）、"核心 VP 紧缩（MiVP）"原则、顺序像似性原则（Haiman，1983）和"[T>R]连动式"原则。生成语法及其衍生的句法理论都预设"C'及其最大投射内都是一个核心且每个节点都是两分结构"并以此进行理论构建。本文根据语言事实和分布分析将中性连动式分析为双核心 V'的 CP 结构，并将 Hawkins（1994，2004）的最小范域原则（MiD）修改为解释力更强的核心 VP 紧缩原则，将其和其它 3 条结构或功能动因置入类双向优选论（bi-OT）分析中，得出它们之间竞争和互协的机制。

总体上，东南亚区域双及物编码倾向的动因效应量等级为：核心 VP 紧缩原则 ＞ 顺序像似性原则 ＞ 可别度领前原则 ＞[T>R]连动式；其中核心 VP 紧缩原则是最强势的动因；顺序像似性原则和可别度领前原则是互相竞争的两条动因；而"[T>R]连动式"原则是对连动式效应量最强的一条动因。

我们知道，事件语义概念结构对编码影响巨大，体现在<R> / Sc 分裂对线性编码的影响。逆向事件编码总体上符合顺序像似性原则，顺向事件编码动因更复杂。从动因角度来看，"Sc /G—R—B"是一个连续统，Sc/G 与 B 由不同的动因驱动，R 与两头均有相似之处，但原型 R 接近 B。

综上所述，东南亚区域语言双及物事件编码有其特有的区域共性，由在线加工难度、语义—形式像似性、语用认知可别度、构式化等因素或竞争或协同地驱

动形成。

关键词：双及物结构；东南亚；区域类型学

Abstract

Ditransitives is a heated-debating topic in recent typological studies. It is defined as a construction consisting of a (ditransitive) verb, an agent argument (A), a recipient-like argument (R), and a theme argument (T). The most typical ditransitive constructions contain a verb of physical transfer such as 'give', 'lend', 'hand', 'sell', 'return' (Malchukov et al. 2010:1-2; 陆丙甫等 2009; c.f. Croft 2003:142-4, 152-4). Cross-linguistically, ditransitives also encodes pure caused motion, caused benefaction, and caused dispossession.

Previous studies (Malchukov et al. 2010; Heine et al. 2010; inter alias) only focus on cross-linguistic tendency, with the areal features off the target. Even in the only trial in this niche, Michaelis et al. (2003) concluded an areal tendency on the basis of the data of WALS 105A (http://wals.info/chapter/105), which solely samples the 'give' constructions around the world. However, 'give' is not a prototypical ditransitive verb, which is demonstrated by our data. The argumentation framework solely based on a non-prototypical verb could be risky. Thus, there sees no comprehensive study on areal universals of ditransitives. In the light of this fact and with the consideration of geographically relatedness, we chose Southeast Asia (hereafter, SEA) as our sampling scope, which covers more than one hundred languages scattering all over the southern part of China. To facilitate the quantitative analysis, more parameters are brought into view, including superficial structures, markedness of Ө, O-V orders, T-{R} orders, Ө-V orders and semantic roles.

In a pool of 152 languages in SEA, we have sorted out all the types of ditransitive constructions and found that V3 languages are inclined to dependent-marking structures, while V2 languages to both SVC and dependent-marking structures. Excluding double object constructions (hereafter, DOC), the linear order of ditransitive constructions of V2 languages are restrictly constrained by Temporal Sequence Principle / Sequence Iconicity Principle, while there is no bias in that of V3 languages, be it R-T or T-R. Considering individual

structures, [VRT] DOCs is dominant over [VTR] and actually DOCs is a kind of highly constructionalized structures. In addition, [T>R] SVC, i.e. [VTVR] and [TVRV] is near-absolutely predominant in SVCs. However, if checking the head-marking structures, it is rare.

Speaking of correlations, structures and Ɵ-markedness are functionally complementary and it is also true of between Ɵ-V orders and T-{R} orders, which both act to disambiguate the role of arguments. However, Ɵ-markedness does not correlate to word orders, but structures do negatively. So to speak, if structures (viz. adpositional structures, hereafter ApOS) function well in disambiguation, word orders do not go into play. If in a reversed scenario, word orders will substitute structures (viz. DOCs) for the function of disambiguation. It results in a compensatory role of word orders, which speeds up the constructionalized of DOCs in a fixed order in a specific language. Outside of frequent structures like ApOSs, SVCs and DOCs, the asymmetry of word orders in scarce structures is related to genetic inheritance without exceptions.

Obviously, there is still an argument due whether the areal universals of SEA (hereafter, U_{SEA}) really exist. The answer is yes thanks to the piece of evidences sorted out from my data to set up a boundary between cross-linguistic universals & genetic inherited features on one side and U_{SEAS} on the other.

If we go back to special ditransitive verbs, 'give' is the best candidate as we have discussed above. Another candidacy goes to verbs of speech. Since it governs a clause as T in most cases, R-T order is regular in line with the Principle of End Weight (Quirk et al. 1972; Arnold et al. 2000).

But how the U_{SEAS} come into play? It is owed to four motivations in terms of syntax, pragmatics and online-processing, which drive the languages in SEA to optimize their inventory, matching with these motivations as much as possible. To name, they are Identification Principle (陆丙甫 2005a, 2005b, 2009), Minimal VP (MiVP) Principle, Sequence Iconicity Principle (Haiman 1983; inter alias) and "[T>R]-SVC" Principle. As is known to us all, generative grammarians and its followers all model their framework on the presupposition that 'C' and those within

its maximum projection are a binary branch under one head'. But it has been argued on the top of language facts and systematic distribution that neutral SVCs are better to be analyzed as a CP with double head V's. One step further, we have revised Hawkins' (1994, 2004) MiD Principle as MiVP to cover a larger spread of phenomena. Co-existing with other three motivations mentioned above, a pseudo-bidirectional-OT analysis has been conducted to figure out the mechanism of the co-existence of this kind. Generally, the Effect Hierarchy of the motivations is as follows:

MiVP > Iconicity > Identification > [T>R]-SVC.

Among them, MiVP absolutely prevails, followed by two competing motivations, i.e. Iconicity and Identification. On the lower end of the hierarchy, [T>R]-SVC specifically restricts the formation of SVCs to the most extent.

As common, the conceptual frames / semantic structures strongly shape the codings in that <R> / Sc split has a say in linear arrangement. The encodings of centrifugal events (i.e. caused dispossession) are motivated by Sequence Iconicity Priniciple, when those of centripetal events are determined by various principles. In the view of motivations, there is a continuum of "Sc/G-R-B". The semantic role(s) at both ends, i.e. Sc/G vs. B, are driven by competing motivations. In the middle, R shares a certain properties with the role(s) on both sides, but the prototypical R is more similar to B.

All in all, the U_{SEAS} of ditransitives are carved out by the co-existing motivations in online-processing, iconicity, identification and constructionalization.