摘要

领属的语义概念具有跨语言的普遍性，是人类生活中普遍存在的一种概念认知；但是作为语法范畴的领属在具体语言中的表现并不一定相同，不同语言在表达领属关系的结构上有很大差异，而这正符合语言类型学研究和解释的目标。但是目前国内关于领属范畴的研究大都是从比较语言学维度，采用认知语言学的理论框架，对比英语和汉语名词性领属结构的特点，包括语法化路径、领属意义对比、领属结构的语用特点等方面，而领属范畴的类型学研究相对薄弱。因此，本文主要是在类型学的视角下探讨英汉领属结构的共性与差异，进而探讨世界语言的领属结构的共性与差异。

本文共八章，内容大致可以分为六个部分。第一部分是绪论和综述，即第1-2章；第二部分是关于名词性领属结构的形态类型，即第3-4章；第三部分是名词性领属结构的语序类型即第5章；第四部分是名词性领属结构的语义类型即第6章；第五部分是跟谓词性领属相关的几个问题即第7章；最后一部分是结论。本文的主要结论如下：

第一，形态类型特点

英汉的领属结构都是附从标志为主；用"'s"和"的"标志的领属结构都具有多义性；英语不需要领属分类词，汉语普通话中领属分类词也不需要强制出现（南方方言除外）。英汉编码方式的不同点还表现在领格方式上。英语属于限定性领格语言即名词短语中领属成分不能跟限定成分共现，整个短语作有定性理解；汉语属于形容性领格语言即领属成分可以跟其他限定词共现，整个名词短语的有定／无定性由定冠词、限定词来推断。这两种领格类型实际上是经济性原则与语用合作原则互相竞争的结果。经济性原则占优势的语言就表现出限定性领格的特点，如英语等语言中冠词与领属语呈互补分布；语用合作原则占优势的语言就表现出形容性领格的特点，如汉语等语言中领属语与其他限定成分并存。

鉴于普通话普遍使用"的"的单一现象，本文遂考察了汉语方言和少数民族语言的领属结构编码方式。我们在22种方言样本的基础上将汉语方言的编码方式总结为三种：无标志、使用人称代词和标记词。无标志的方式主要用于亲属-集体名词；人称代词又分为两种情况，领有者使用复数人称代词表示单数意义以及在领有者和被领有者中间添加单数第三人称代词"他"；标记词包括使用定语助词、指示词和量词。汉藏语系诸语言的领属结构大部分都有表领属的结构助词，有的语言还有专门的领属助词。阿尔泰语系中突厥语族的特点是：人称领属非常复杂，三个人称单复数的领格形式都不同，第二人称还要区分普通形式和尊称。蒙古语族诸语言普遍存在领宾格，意义要根据语境确定，而且蒙古语族诸语言有人称领属和反身领属范畴。南岛语系的突出特征是领属语前置后置都带标志，前

置的时候是双重标志，后置的时候是领属语标志，属于附从标志。南亚语系的基本特征是：诸语言基本都是直接并置结构，不用格助词。

世界语言范围来看，名词性领属结构的编码方式主要有简单方式和复杂方式。简单方式包括简单并置和音调变化。复杂方式包括使用前缀、后缀和格附缀。领格附缀是世界语言表达领属范畴最常见的形式，有些语言也用其他格形式如处所格、与格以及伴随格来表达领属结构。领属附缀要分前缀与后缀，并且以后缀居多，因为前缀的使用会增大信息处理难度。如果一种语言有可让渡与不可让渡的区分，那么一般不可让渡的领属关系倾向使用附缀形式，可让渡的领属关系通常添加其他语素。不使用附缀表达领属结构的语言有领属代词或者领属形容词。领属分类词也是名词性领属结构中一种重要的编码方式。领属分类词又分为领有者分类词，领有关系分类词和被领有者分类词。其中领有者分类词规模最小，使用频率最少，这是由领有者的特征决定的。领有关系分类词与被领有者分类词通常合二为一。

领属结构的标志位置与基本语序有一定的相关性，SOV 和 SVO 语序中都是附从标志占优势，其中 SVO 语序中占绝对优势。标志位置与语言的形态类型也有一定的相关性，孤立语、屈折语和黏着语中附从标志占比一半以上，其中屈折语中附从标志占绝对优势，而插编语是附核标志占优势。

第二、语序类型特点

英汉领属结构语序的共性是二者都有 GN（领属语+中心名词）语序，都不受语义关系和领有者分类的影响。差异是英语的领属结构有两种语序，而且不分主次，二者关系名词的语法化模式也不一样。英语的关系名词语法化模式符合 SVO 语言的模式，汉语的关系名词语法化模式同于 SOV 语言的语法化模式，而且汉语中 GN 语序格局为绝对优势语序，而在语序的相关组配中，GN 是 SOV 语序中的相对优势语序，由此证明汉语属于 OV-VO 混合型语序语言。

英语中两种语序格局并存或许跟英语语序由 OV 向 VO 的转变有关，古英语是 OV 语序，而现代英语受拉丁语的影响已经转变成 VO 语序。我们预测"'s"结构最终将被"of"结构取代，最终只有一种领属结构。该预测基于三个理由：从领属结构的语序与 VO/OV 语序的和谐性考虑；从领属结构本身的和谐性考虑；从使用频率考虑。

第三、语义类型特点

领有者类型中生命度越高的越容易充任领属语，生命度越低的越倾向充任被领有者。典型的被领有者应该是表类指的普通名词，表单指的代词和专名的所指已经足够明确，无需限定。跨语言来看，能否充当被领有者跟文化差异性关系很大。

被领有者根据语义划分有两分法、三分法和四分法。两分法即可让渡与不可让渡；三分法和四分法的语言都倾向把所有权及亲属关系单独区分。我们还没有发现有四类以上分类法的语言，好像使用某种语言的总人数越少，分类法越详细，这说明他们需要明确每种被领有者的所属关系。这些都一定程度上反映了经济性原则对语言现象的影响和制约。

可让渡与不可让渡关系的语言都会在表现形式上有所区别，不可让渡关系的形式往往比可让渡关系的形式在结构上更紧密。不可让渡关系的领属结构，其内部语言距离更小。虽然英汉对于可否让渡这个关系类型都不敏感，但是汉语"的"隐现规律还是与可让渡性有关，在不可让渡领属结构中，"的"的出现是选择性的；而在可让渡领属结构中，"的"的出现则是强制性的。汉语里有一个奇怪的现象就是身体部位词和一般物品词是一类，不能出现在不带"的"的领属结构里，亲属词是另一类，"的"可带可不带。本文认为汉语中身体部位词的特殊性与其他语言中的一些现象有共同之处，这些语言现象背后同本民族的宗教文化有很大关系。所以跨语言来看，目前还难以建立足以解释所有语言的完全通行的不可让渡等级序列。

第四、"有"与"have"

"have"和"有"各阶段的语法化程度不尽相同。英语已经发展出以"have"为助动词的完成体系统，形式上存在略缩形式，标记语法化程度较高；而汉语"有"的使用不具有强制性，仅是完成体标记，故语法化程度相对较低。世界上很多语言的完成体标记是从领有动词虚化而来的，这说明该现象具有跨语言的规律，其背后有共同的认知机制和动因。

关键词：名词性领属；谓词性领属；形态类型；语序类型；语义类型；类型学

Abstract

The semantic concept of possession is a common conceptual cognition in human life, which has a cross-language universality. But possession as a grammatical category does not have the same expression in specific languages. There are significant differences in the expression of structures of possession relations in different languages, which is consistent with the goal of study and interpretation in the language typology study. Current researches on the possessive category adopt the framework of cognitive linguistics and the perspective of comparative linguistics to make comparison of the characteristics of attributive possessive structures between English and Chinese, including aspects of grammaticalization path, contrast and comparison of the possessive meanings, and the pragmatic feature of the possessive structure. However, the typological studies on the possessive category are relatively inadequate. Therefore, the present study mainly investigates the similarities and differences of the possessive category between English and Chinese from typological perspective, then further discusses the properties of possessive structure of world languages.

The dissertation consists of eight chapters which are roughly divided into six parts. The first part is composed of Chapter 1 introduction and Chapter 2 Literature Review. The second part includes Chapter 3 and 4 which introduces the morphological types of attributive possessive structures. The third part, Chapter 5, is the word order pattern of attributive possessive structures. The fourth part, Chapter 6, is the semantic type of attributive possessive structure. The fifth part, Chapter Seven, discusses questions in relation to predicateive possessive structures. The last part, Chapter 8, concludes the study. The main conclusions of the present study are as follows:

1. Characteristics of Morphological Type

The possessive structures of both English and Chinese are mainly dependent-marking, but the genitive types of both languages are different. English is a determiner-genitive language while Chinese is an adjective-genitive language. The encoding method of Chinese dialects falls into three types: the use of non-marker form, personal pronouns and conjunctions. Non-marker form is mainly applied to

kinship nouns and collective nouns. The personal pronoun is divided into two types. One is that the possessor uses the plural personal pronoun to indicate the singular meaning, and the third person singular pronoun-"he" is added between the possessor and the possessum. The other is that conjunctions include the use of attributive auxiliaries, demonstratives and classifiers. Most possessive structures of Sino-Tibetan languages have structural auxiliaries to denote possessive relation, and even some languages have their own special possessive auxiliary words. Turkic Language branch of the Altaic family is characterized by the followings: Personal possession is very complicated. The forms of the singular and plural of three persons are different. The common form and respectful form is distinguished in the second person. The objectives prevail in all languages of Mongolian group, whose meaning is determined according to the context. Moreover, the Mongolian languages include personal possession and reflexive possession. The prominent feature of the Austronesian family is that the preposition and postposition of the possession are marked. There are double markers with prepositive possession and possessive markers with postpositive possession belonging to dependent marker. The basic characteristic of the South Asian language family is that all languages are basically and directly juxtaposed -structured without case auxiliary particle.

Observed from the scope of the world language, the encoding of attributive possessive structure is mainly divided into two methods: simple and complex ones. The simple method includes apposition and inflection, and the complicated method includes prefixation, suffixation and the use of clitic. Possessive clitic is the most common method to express the possessive category in the world languages. Some languages are also used in other methods to express the possessive structure, such as locative, dative and comitative. The possessive clitic should be divided into prefixes and suffixes, and the suffixes are in majority, because the use of prefixes will make the information processing more difficult. If a language has the distinction between alienability and inalienability, the possessive relation of inalienability generally tends to use the form of clitic, and the possessive relation of alienability usually adds other morphemes in addition to clitic. A language that does not use affixes to express the possessive structure has possessive pronouns or possessive adjectives. The possessive classifier is also an important encoding method in the attributive possession. The possessive classifier is divided into the possessor classifier, possessive relation

classifier and possessum classifier. Among them, the possessor classifier has the smallest scale and the least utilization frequency, which is determined by the characteristics of the possessor. Besides, there is usually a combination between the possessive relation classifier and the possessum classifier.

There is a certain correlation between the locus of marking in possessive noun phrases and the basic word order. In both SOV word order and SVO word order, dependent-marking is dominant, and it occupies the absolute advantage in SVO word order. There is also a certain correlation between the locus of marking and language morphology. Among isolate language, inflectional language and agglutinative languages, dependent-marking accounts for more than half of them. Dependent-marking in the inflectional language is dominant, while head-marking in the polysynthetic language is dominant.

2. Characteristics of Word Order Pattern

The similarity of word order pattern between English and Chinese is that both of them have GN(genitive-noun) order. Besides, they are not affected by the semantic relations and possessor classification. However, English has two patterns of word order without distinction. In addition, The grammaticalization pattern of relational noun are not the same. The grammaticalization pattern of English relational nouns accords with the pattern of SVO languages. While the grammaticalization pattern of Chinese relation nouns is the same as the SOV languages. Moreover, the word order pattern of GN in Chinese is the absolute dominant order, but in the relevant collocations of word order, GN is the relative dominant order in the SOV word order, which proves that Chinese is the language with OV-VO mixed word orders.

The coexistence of the two word order patterns in English may be related to the word order conversion (from OV to VO). Old English takes the OV word order, while modern English influenced by Latin language has been transformed into the VO word order. Therefore, we predict that the "s" structure will eventually be replaced by the "of" structure, and there will be only one type of genitive construction ultimately. This prediction bases on three considerations: the harmony of the possessive structure order and the VO/OV order; the harmony of possessive structure itself; the frequency of utilization.

3. Characteristics of Semantic Type

Among possessor types, the higher animacy it has, the easier it serves as a possessor. Conversely, the lower animacy it has, the easier it serves as a possessum. The typical poseeseum refers to common nouns, which indicates generic reference, the pronouns which indicates singular reference and the proper noun whose influence is explicit and requires no further definition. Observed from the perspective of cross-language, whether it can serve as a possessum, the cultural aspects has great influence.

Based on the meaning, the possessum can be classified into three types: binary division, trichotomy, and quartering. Binary division usually equals alienablity and inalienablity; the language of trichotomy and quartering tends to distinguish the ownership and relationship separately. We have not found a language that has more than four categories of taxonomies. It seems that the less people use a language, the more detailed its taxonomy is, which indicates that they need to be clear about the ownership of each possessum. To some extent, all of these reflect the impact and restriction of economy principles on the linguistic phenomenon.

The languages which distinguish between alienablity and inalienablity usually have different forms, and the form of inalienablity is more compact than that of alienablity, which has smaller internal language distance. Although both English and Chinese are not sensitive to whether the relationships are alienable or not, the omitting rules of Chinese character "的"(structural particle in Chinese) are related to alienability. The appearance of "的"is selective in inalienable possessions but mandatory in alienable possessions. One special phenomena in Chinese is that the words represent body parts and general items fall into the same category which cannot appear in possessions without "的", but kinship words, which fall into the other category, can be in an optional possession. This study holds that the particularity of words representing body parts in Chinese has something in common with certain phenomena in other languages, and the religious culture of the nation has a great influence on these language phenomena. Therefore, from the cross-linguistic perspective, it is still difficult to establish a fully feasible inalienable hierarchical sequence applying to all languages.

4. "You" and "Have"

The degree of grammaticalization of "have" is not the same as "you" at various stages. A perfect tense system with "have" as the auxiliary verb has been developed in

English, which has abbreviations in form and a high degree of grammaticalization of markers; however, the use of the Chinese character"you" is not mandatory. It is only the perfect tense marker, therefore, its degree of grammaticalization is relatively low. The perfect tense markers of many languages in the world are grammaticalized from the possession verbs, which indicates that this phenomenon has a universal implication, with common cognitive mechanisms and motivations behind it.

Key Words: Attributive Possession; Predicative Possession; Morphological Types; Word order Patterns; Semantic Types; Typology