

CONTENTS

Articles

- 1 古文字與上古音札記三則 (Three Notes on Ancient Chinese Scripts and Old Chinese Phonology)
梅祖麟 (Tsu-Lin MEI)
- 23 從否定詞到疑問助詞 (The Pathway from Negatives to Question Particles)
魏培泉 (Pei-chuan WEI)
- 59 The Double-object Construction in Archaic Chinese: A Preliminary Proposal from the Constructional Perspective (從構式語法看上古漢語的雙賓結構：一個初步的討論)
Chiew Pheng PHUA (潘秋平)
- 99 論動詞「捷」的語義發展 (The History of Amoy *kij6*)
楊秀芳 (Hsiu-fang YANG)
- 117 方言接觸及混淆形式的產生——論漢語方言「膝蓋」一詞的歷史演變 (Dialect Contact and the Production of Contaminated Forms — A Reconstruction of the History of Chinese Words for “Knee”)
岩田禮 (Ray IWATA)
- 147 Sino-Khitán Phonology (漢—契丹語音系)
Zhongwei SHEN (沈鍾偉)
- 211 The Diversity of the Tibeto-Burman Language Family and the Linguistic Ancestry of Chinese (藏緬語族的多樣性和漢語的語言隸屬)
George van DRIEM (無我)

Appendices

- 271 Appendix I: Notes from the Editors
- 272 Appendix II: The International Conference Celebrating The Publication of the *Complete Works of Li Fang-Kuei* and The Publication of the *Bulletin of Chinese Linguistics* (慶祝《李方桂全集》出版及《中國語言學集刊》出版國際學術會議)

274	Appendix III: : The Li Fang-Kuei Society for Chinese Linguistics: The 2006 Book Award
275	Appendix IV: 李方桂語言學論著獎申請辦法
276	Appendix V: 紀念李方桂先生中國語言學研究學會的公開信 Letter from the Li Fang-Kuei Society for Chinese Linguistics
280	Appendix VI: Donors to the Li Fang-Kuei Society Endowment Fund

古文字與上古音札記三則

梅祖麟

康奈爾大學

0. 引言











近年來方述鑫等《甲骨金文字典》(1993)，陳初生《金文常用字典》(初版1986，增訂本2004)，劉翔、陳抗、陳初生、董琨編著《商周古文字讀本》(1989)相繼出版，讓我這種古文字的門外漢短時期內能掌握甲骨金文的基本知識。同時龔煌城《漢藏語研究論文集》(2002)利用漢藏比較的成果解決了若干上古音研究中的懸案。下面寫出來的就是三四年來同時讀這兩種著作所做的札記。

1. 喪、桑

《說文》：「喪，亡也。从哭从亡。會意。亡亦聲。」李方桂(1980: 24-25, 1983: 401)據此擬構了 *sm- > s-：

- (1) 喪 *smang > s̄ang
- (2) 亡 *mjang > mjang

(1)的擬構面臨兩個問題。(i)跟 *sm- > x- 衝突，例如「黑」*smək > xək，「荒」*smang > xwāng。(ii)「喪」字以「亡」為聲符之說在古文字中沒有依據。

「喪」字甲骨文作、、，金文作 (旂作父戊鼎)、 (毛公鼎)、 (量侯簋)。甲骨文和金文的差別在於後者有「亡」(甲骨文、，金文、)字的成分，前者沒有。

古文字學家對「喪」字的解釋多半都導源於于省吾(1979: 75-77)〈釋桑〉的說法：

從否定詞到疑問助詞

魏培泉

中央研究院

1. 前言

現代漢語方言的一般問句形式上可以大致分為如下幾類：¹

(甲) 疑問助詞問句：簡寫作助詞問句，也寫作 VP-prt。(你吃雞嗎？)²

(乙) 否定詞居後型正反問句：也寫作 VP-neg。(你吃雞不？)

(丙) 動詞重疊型正反問句：也寫作 VP-neg-VP。

(丙一) 順刪式：也寫作 V-(O)-neg-V。(你吃(雞)不吃？)

(丙二) 逆刪式：也寫作 V-neg-V-(O)。(你吃不吃(雞)？)³

(丁) 疑問副詞問句：簡寫作副詞問句，也寫作 adv-VP。(你可吃雞？)

(戊) 否定詞居中型正反問句：也寫作 [M-neg]-V(N)P。⁴

(你是否吃雞？)(M = modal verb; modal adverb)

(己) 混合式：丁式與其他諸式之混合式。(你可吃不吃？)

¹ 現代漢語學者常把問句分為特指問句、是非問句、選擇問句、正反問句等四類(部分學者把正反問句稱為反復問句，有的學者還把副詞問句也歸入反復問句)。本文的一般問句相當是非問句和正反問句，也是廣義的是非問句。此外，本文還以答語的情況來給一般問句分出是非問和選言問兩種。這裡的是非問意義比傳統的是非問句要窄，所指限為可以用「是的」或「不是」回答的提問；選言問則需就問句給的正反選項擇一而答，不能直接用「是的」或「不是」回答(但問句的動詞如果是「是」就不在此列)。就筆者所知的漢語方言的一般情況，正反問句不屬是非問；助詞問句多屬是非問；副詞問句多屬選言問。除了本文所列，漢語方言還有其他的句式，但因為較罕見且與本文所論無涉，故從略。

² 本文採用的符號及其所指意義如下：prt (句末疑問助詞)，neg (句末否定詞)，NQ (兼指問句句末的否定詞以及由它虛化而來的疑問助詞)，NQp (來自 p- 聲母的 NQ)，NQm (來自 m- 聲母的 NQ)，adv (疑問副詞)，VP (動詞組)，O (賓語，包括動詞組賓語)，conj (連詞)。

³ 這裡寫作「逆刪式」只是行文之便。就現代漢語而言，我們同意黃正德(1989)的分析，即這種句式是由一種重疊律產生的。

⁴ 有關此式的歷史與方言分佈可參魏培泉(2005)。

The Double-object Construction in Archaic Chinese: A Preliminary Proposal from the Constructional Perspective

Chiew Pheng PHUA
Nanyang Technological University

1. Introduction

Peyraube (1986, 1987, 1988a) identifies three main dative constructions in Archaic Chinese, *viz*:

Verb + Indirect Object (IO) + Direct Object (DO)
Verb + Direct Object (DO) + *yu* + Indirect Object (IO)
yi + Direct Object (DO) + Verb + Indirect Object (IO)

The following are some examples to illustrate the three dative constructions:

- (1) 公賜之食 (左傳: 隱.1 *Zuozhuan: Yin.1*)
gong ci zhi shi
duke offer 3:SG food
'The Duke offered him food.'
- (2) 堯讓天下于許由 (莊子: 逍遙遊 *Zhuangzi: Xiaoyao You*)
yao rang tian xia yu xu you
Yao bequeath Empire DAT Xu You
'Yao bequeathed the Empire to Xu You.'
- (3) 孔子以其兄之子妻之 (論語: 先進 *Lunyu: Xianjin*)
kong zi yi qi xiong zhi zi qi zhi
Confucius INST 3:SG:POSS brother GEN daughter give-for-marriage 3:SG
'Confucius gave him his elder brother's daughter to marry.'

Among the three, the double-object construction is the most widely discussed grammatical construction, and an enormous literature has been accumulated in recent

論動詞「榧」的語義發展*

楊秀芳

台灣大學

1. 前言

古漢語「榧」指稱用來閉門的直木，與橫持門戶的關合組成一個不易撼動的閉門裝置。「關」和「榧」都兼有名詞和動詞的用法，也都發展出多種語義。本文主要從語義發展的角度，探討動詞「榧」的語義問題。

動詞「榧」最早的抵門之義，現在還保留在閩南語中；動詞「榧」所發展出的各種語義，閩南語也多仍保留。本文除探討文獻所見動詞「榧」的語義問題外，並根據方言材料，論證廈門方言表示阻擋、支持、撐開的 *kiŋ6*¹ 來自「榧」。

本文第 2 節討論文獻所見「榧」的動詞用法，並及於相關的「關」。第 3 節討論廈門話 *kiŋ6* 的語義用法，並比較漳州、泉州、潮州的方言變體，從音義兩方面論證閩南語這個詞和「榧」具有同源關係。第 4 節結論。

2. 文獻所見「榧」的動詞用法

「榧」字見於兩漢以前文獻者，有名詞、動詞兼類的抵門義，動詞用法又發展產生支持義、阻塞義等幾種用法。關於抵門之木的榧，它後來在形制上的發

* 本文曾宣讀於 2006 年 5 月中央研究院語言學研究所等單位主辦之「慶祝李方桂全集出版及中國語言學集刊出版國際學術會議」，承與會學者提供寶貴意見，又經本刊審查人提供修改建議，至為感謝。又，本文寫作期間曾利用中研院漢籍電子文獻資料庫，獲得許多協助，謹此一併申謝。

¹ 本文以 1、2、3、4、5、6、7、8 分別代表陰平、陽平、陰上、陽上、陰去、陽去、陰入、陽入調類，置音節尾。另 0 代表語流中的輕聲讀法。下文將說明這個語詞本字為陽上字「榧」，潮州話陽上、陽去能分，這個語詞讀為陽上調；廈門話陽上、陽去不分，Douglas (1873) 標為陽去調。本文論及潮州話時標陽上第四調，否則依廈門系統標為陽去第六調。

方言接觸及混淆形式的產生 —論漢語方言「膝蓋」一詞的歷史演變*

岩田禮
金澤大學

1. 前言

本文試圖通過語言地理學的方法構擬出漢語“膝蓋”一詞的歷史演變。我們認為，文獻記載只能偶爾露出常用詞歷史演變的若干片斷，而詳細的方言地圖則能提供較為全面的資料，用以構擬出十分詳細的歷史變化過程。可能有人認為語言地理學只能研究個別詞語的歷史而缺少點普遍性，其實不然，我們研究的最終目的在於闡明語言變化的普遍性。諸如同音衝突、類音牽引等歐洲語言地理學的創始者所發現的現象必定也在漢語的歷史變化過程中起過重要作用，而漢語的歷史研究歷來都忽視這些因素（參看 Dausat 1922，賀登崧 2003）。

關於“膝蓋”，筆者已在幾篇論文中加以討論（岩田 1986，2000；Iwata 1995），但仍有幾個重要的問題尚待全面剖析。近得重新繪製“膝蓋”的方言地圖，據此認識到下列兩點。

- （一）構詞法分析的重要性：Iwata (1995) 根據構詞法的不同將東南方言分為東西兩塊，而此分析法應適用於所有詞形的分類中。
- （二）產生混淆形式的機制：Iwata (1995) 發現長江沿岸所產生的一種混淆形式，其實不止於此，其他地區也曾產生過幾種混淆形式，而其產生過程則有某種規律性。

本文所說的“混淆形式”是指由所指相同的兩種詞形產生的折半形式，多出

* 本文是筆者與日本的同仁正在進行的科研項目 (Grant-in-aid for Scientific Research (B), Project No. 16320051, 2004-2006) 的一個成果。本文初稿曾在中央研究院語言研究所召開的“慶祝《李方桂全集》出版及《中國語言學集刊》出版國際學術會議”（2006年5月30-31日）宣讀。

Sino-Khitani Phonology

Zhongwei SHEN

University of Massachusetts Amherst

1. Introduction

Two functionally distinct scripts, the so-called Greater Script and Lesser Script, were invented by the Khitans in the early part of the Liao dynasty (907-1125) to write the Khitan language. Scholars in general agree that the Greater Script is logographic, representing morphological units, and the Lesser Script is phonetic, representing phonological units. The texts written in the Lesser Script remain basically unreadable, however, many Chinese proper nouns, such as official titles, place names, and personal names, have been convincingly deciphered with a high degree of confidence. The focus of this paper is on the Chinese transliterations, which actually form a phonological system of Sino-Khitani. In the following analyses we would like to show that the phonology of Sino-Khitani can provide valuable information about the northern Chinese phonology of the 11th and 12th centuries or even earlier.

Various proposals have been raised to decipher the basic graphs, the so-called *yuanzi* 原字 (abbr. YZ), of the Lesser Script. The most influential proposal is Chinggeltai *et al.*'s *Qidan Xiaozi Yanjiu* 契丹小字研究 (*The Studies of the Khitan Lesser Script*, hereafter QXY) of 1985. In this book a table lists the reconstructed phonetic values of 98 YZ graphs¹, all of which are used to transliterate proper nouns in Chinese. This table represents a significant step in the decipherment of Chinese words, but it is unfortunate that the decipherment is done in a rather sporadic way and clearly lacks systematic treatment. The same reconstructed values are used in Chinggeltai's *Qidan Xiaozi Shidu Wenti* 契丹小字釋讀問題 (*The Issues of the Decipherment of the*

¹ In the *Qidan Xiaozi Yanjiu*, the YZ graphs used to transliterate Chinese words are basically contained in the first table of the reconstruction of the phonetic values of *yuanzi* (pp. 81-109). Two additional tables, the second table (p. 130) and the third table (p. 146), are provided. In these two tables all the reconstructions are about Khitan words. The contents of these three tables are summarized in a comprehensive table on pages 152 and 153. For the purpose of our study, the first table is most relevant, because it lists all the YZ graphs for transliterating Chinese words.

The Diversity of the Tibeto-Burman Language Family and the Linguistic Ancestry of Chinese*

George van DRIEM

Leiden University

1. Japhetic, Atactic, Turanian and Indo-Chinese

In mediaeval Europe, most scholars came to terms with the world's linguistic diversity within the framework of a Biblical belief system. Even at the end of the eighteenth century, pious scholars such as Sir William Jones believed that the myth of the Tower of Babel explained how 'the language of Noah' had been 'lost irretrievably' (1793: 489). Another Biblical view attempted to explain the world's linguistic stocks as deriving from Noah's three sons after the deluge had abated in the well-known Judæo-Christian myth of the ark. The descendants of Shem populated the earth with Semitic speaking peoples, whereas the descendants of Ham today spoke 'Scythian' languages, whilst all other languages derived from the progeny of Noah's eldest son Japhet.

The Semitic languages most notably include Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament. The Semitic language family is known today as Afroasiatic. Scythian or 'Scythisch' is a language family first identified in Leiden by Marcus van Boxhorn (1647), although van Boxhorn did not invoke Biblical mythology in any of his own writings. His theory of language relationship was renamed Indo-Germanic or Indo-European in the 19th century. In 1647, 'Scythisch' specifically included Sanskrit, known to van Boxhorn through the vocabulary recorded by Ctesias of Cnidos in the fifth century BC,¹ and all the then known branches of Indo-European, *viz.* Latin, Greek, Celtic, Germanic, Indo-Iranian, Baltic and Slavonic.

* This paper was presented on 27 May 2006 as a keynote address to the joint meeting of the 14th Annual Conference of the International Association of Chinese Linguistics and the 10th International Symposium on Chinese Languages and Linguistics at the Academia Sinica in Taipei.

¹ Ctesias was a Greek traveller, who had been captured at the battle of Cunaxa (*gerebatur* 401 BC) and then resided at Susa, where he served as a physician to the court of Artaxerxes Mnemon for twenty years.