

摘 要

标句词一般被定义为补足语从句的句法标记, 就如英语中的 *that, if* 等。在许多语言中, 都有从言说动词演变为标句词的现象。已有研究认为, 汉语的“说”中也是一个由相同形式的言说动词演变而来的标句词, 并且作为标句词的“说”在分布上位于主句谓语动词及其宾语从句之间。

以往对标句词“说”的研究并不充分, 集中在语法化问题的讨论上, 而对其他问题则很少涉及。同时, 标句词这个概念在汉语学界的使用也是高度混杂的, 包括多种虚词在内。有鉴于此, 本研究将致力于两个目标: 一是厘清标句词以及与之相关的补足语和补足语小句等概念; 二是深化对汉语标句词“说”的研究。

通过对以往文献的梳理, 我们发现补足语的区别性特征是在句法上作为小句或句子谓语的必有成分, 藉此可以将补足语与次级谓语、附加语等概念区分开来。同时, 这一特征也是定义补足语小句的关键所在。另外, 标句词这个概念在功能语法和生成语法中“名同而实异”。功能语法所说的标句词就是一般所定义的补足语小句标记, 而生成语法中所说的标句词则是指小句结构中的一个句法位置, 或者是该位置上固有的显性标记。

对汉语标句词“说”的研究, 主要包括以下四个方面的内容:

一、“说”的语法性质。通过论元选择、完成体标记、重叠形式等句法测试手段来证明作为连动后项的“说”已经不是一个动词。就“说”的意义而言, 标句词“说”主要用于标记主句动词与宾语小句之间的语法关系, 而引语标记“说”和非人称引语标记“说”仍与宾语小句所表达的话语内容相联系。“说”在句法和语义两方面的表现源于语法化中去范畴化和去语义化这两个机制的作用。

二、标句词的判断。对给定成分是否为标句词的判断要从其概念本质出发, 即是否具有标记补足语小句的功能。基于这一点, 我们对汤廷池(1989a, 1989b, 1992)和方梅(2006)的观点提出了完全不同的看法: 1) 英语里的疑问式标句词 *if, whether* 等只能标记补足语从句的疑问语气, 与此不同的是, 而汉语里的“吗、呢”等只能表达整个复杂句或独立小句的疑问语气, 因此不是标句词。2) 汉语

中的“说”后附于主句的现象属于核心语标记手段，并不是语法化程度低的表现。

3) 同位语从句相对于核心名词而言不具有必有性，因此不是补足语从句。相应地，同位语从句标记也不是标句词。

三、“说”的语法化。以往对汉语标准语以及各种方言中，从言说动词到标句词语法化路径的重构表现出很大的差异。但问题是，既然所有的路径都具有相同的语源概念和目标概念，又如何会产生这些差异呢？通过对各种路径的比较，以及对汉语中言说动词的多功能性的分析，我们认为“言说动词→引语标记→标句词”这条演变路径最具有理据性，同时也符合语言共性中的表现。在言说动词语法化为引语标记的过程中，动词语义的单向蕴含关系是动因，重新分析是机制；而在引语标记语法化为标句词的过程中，概念隐喻是动因，类推是机制。

四、标句词“说”的语用功能。通常认为，标句词“说”在句中出现与否，并不会对包含宾语小句的整个复杂句产生影响。然而，根据我们对“媒体语言语料库”中标句词“说”使用情况的考察，发现它倾向于与第三人称主句主语和非叙实主句动词共现，而当主句主语为第一人称时，又倾向于与第三人称的小句主语共现。这些共现的现象表明，标句词“说”具有标记宾语小句中的命题在心理距离上与说话人相疏远的功能，表现出说话人对宾语小句中信息来源的不确定。

关键词：“说”，标句词，引语标记，非人称引语标记，言说动词，语法化

Abstract

Complementizers are generally known as syntactic makers that introduce a complement clause, just as *that, if*, etc. in English. In many languages in the world, complementizers are derived from *verba dicendi*, or verbs of ‘saying’. Previous studies have argued that *shuo* (说) in Chinese is also a complementizer derived from the *verba dicendi* of the same form, and as a complementizer, *shuo* tends to occur between the matrix verbs and their object complement clauses.

As we can see, the main concern of the previous studies is the grammaticalization of *shuo* from a verb of saying to a complementizer, but other problems are seldom touched. Meanwhile, the concept of complementizer is shown to be highly heterogeneous in Chinese academia, and dominated by a number of function words. According to status quo of the studies, the present study is dedicated to attain two aims: one is to identify complementizer and two relevant concepts named complement and complement clause. The other is to deepen the research of complementizer *shuo*.

For the first one, we find that the distinctive feature of complements is playing an obligatory syntactic or semantic role to complete the meaning of the predicate of a clause or sentence, by which complement can be distinguished with secondary predicates and adjuncts. And it is also the key feature of complement clauses. Moreover, the concepts of complementizer are quite different in functional grammar and generative grammar. The former take it as the general definition, i.e. the syntactic marker of complement clauses, and the latter uses it to refer a position in clause structure or the overt syntactic makers which are inherent to the position.

The second aim is embodied by the following four aspects:

1. The grammatical properties of *shuo*. It argues that *shuo* as V_2 in the serial verb construction is not a verb and supports the proposal by different syntactic tests, such

as argument selection, perfect markers and reduplication. When it comes to the meanings, complementizer *shuo* mainly express the grammatical role between matrix verbs and object complement clauses, but the quotative marker *shuo* and the impersonal quotative marker *shuo* are associated with the semantic content of the object complement clauses. Both of the syntactic and semantic representation of *shuo* are respectively resulted from the mechanisms of decategorialization and desemantization in grammaticalization.

2. The judgment of complementizer. The judgment about whether a given form is a complementizer or not should be made in accordance with the essence of the concept, i.e. the function of marking a complementizer clause. Based on this, we propose three views different from Tang (1989a, 1989b, 1992) and Fang (2006): (1) English interrogative complementizers, such as *if* and *whether*, indicate the interrogative mood of the complementizer clause. While Chinese particles, such as *ma* (吗) and *ne* (呢), mark the interrogative mood of the whole complex sentence or the independent clause, therefore cannot be called complementizers. (2) The clausal enclitic *shuo* in Chinese is a head-marker, not a low grammaticalized complementizer. (3) The appositive clause, not necessary to the main clause, is not complementizer clause. Thus, the appositive marker is not a complementizer.

3. The grammaticalization of *shuo*. As we can see, pathways of the change from the verb of ‘saying’ to complementizer in Mandarin and many dialects are characterized by great variation. The question is that how the differences come about, since all of the pathways just have the same source concepts and the same target concepts. By evaluating these pathways and analyzing the multi-functionality of the verbs of ‘saying’ in Sinitic languages, we substantiate that the pathway of ‘the verb of say → quotative marker → complementizer’ is the most reasonable one and it also corresponds to the language universals. In the first step of the evolution, the unidirectional implication between *shuo* and the former verb motivated *shuo* to be reanalyzed as quotative marker; in the second step of the evolution, analogy is the mechanism and conceptual metaphor is the motivation.

4. The pragmatic function of the complementizer *shuo*. It has been said that the

presence and the the absence of the complementizer *shuo* may yields the same interpretation of the whole complex sentences which contain an object complement clause. However, the usage of *shuo* in National Broadcast Media Language Corpus show that the complementizer *shuo* tends to co-occur with the third person matrix subject and the non-factive matrix verb, and when the matrix subject is the first person, it tends to co-occur with the third person subject of the object clause. On the basis of these co-occurences, we attempt to point out that when *shuo* is used, the speaker mainly intend to make a long psychological which distances himself from the proposition of the object clauses, and mark the speaker's uncertainty about the source of information.

Key words: *shuo*; complementizer; quotative marker; impersonal quotative marker; utterance verb; grammaticalization