

中文摘要

本论文以类型学为视角,采用文献收集、定量与定性研究相结合、语料分析与语法判断相结合的研究方法,将语言类型学的主要研究成果和理论解释与对比语言学的理论框架有机结合在一起,以英汉小说为语料(提取了两部英语小说中的738个关系从句及其三个不同译者翻译的对应译文,提取了四部中文小说中合计1044个关系从句以及其中738个关系从句的三个不同译者翻译的对应译文),对比分析了英汉名词短语的关系化策略、英汉关系从句在句法、语义和语用功能上的异同;对英汉关系从句中存在的争论焦点进行逐一剖析,并利用英汉关系从句的互译实例对其进行验证,得出较为可信的、可证伪的结论,同时对英汉关系从句的翻译提出了可行性建议。

本文的研究内容和章节安排简单介绍如下:

第一章为引论。该部分介绍了英汉名词短语关系化现象的研究现状,梳理了五十多年来中外学者们对英汉名词短语关系化的研究内容、研究成果以及采用的研究方法等,重点指出其中存在的不足之处。此外,介绍了本研究的选题意义和主要内容、拟采用的理论框架、语料的选择和处理等。

第二章界定了英汉名词短语的分类和本文所研究的关系从句的范围。为了更好地进行英汉对比,本文扩大了类型学家对关系从句的研究范围,将英语的非限定关系从句和汉语中无定名词短语的关系从句都纳入了研究范围。从语义角度定义了关系从句,区分了汉语的“广义的关系从句”和“狭义的关系从句”。

第三章以类型学的研究成果为基础,对比分析了英汉名词短语关系化策略的异同。研究发现,两种语言采用关系化策略的相同之处在于都可以采纳空位策略和复指代词策略。相异之处在于,汉语中可以采用空位策略和复指代词策略关系化主语和宾语,而英语中的空位策略只能用于关系化直接宾语和旁语。英语中使用最多的是关系代词策略,汉语中没有这一关系化策略。此外,两种语言中使用关系化策略的差异还体现在:英语中无论是对主语属格语还是对宾语属格语进行关系化,都使用关系代词“whose”。而汉语对主语属格语和宾语属格语进行关系化时呈现出不对称现象。

第四章对比分析了英汉关系从句句法生成的异同。基于 Vries (2002)

对不同语言类型考察的基础之上推导出的关系化提升理论框架,考察了英汉关系从句句法生成的异同,重点评析了汉语关系从句句法生成的研究成果中存在的不足。验证了刘礼进(2010)提出的汉语关系从句句法生成的观点:英汉语带论元关系从句的生成方式原则上相同,都是通过算子/空算子移位和核心名词提升操作生成的;汉语关系从句的生成需增加最后一步“残余移位”(remnant movement):把关系从句移至 Spec-DP,以生成 A 结构(RC DN);或移入限定词与核心名词之间,生成 B 结构(D RC N)。

第五章探讨英汉关系从句的篇章分布特征。重点探讨了英语有定名词和无定名词短语充当中心语时关系代词的选择情况、中心语在从句中的句法功能和关系从句在主句中的句法功能,以及限定性关系从句与非限定性关系从句的篇章分布特征等。发现英语中有定名词短语被关系化的比例要远远高于无定名词短语,限定性关系从句出现的频次也远高于非限定性关系从句;但中心语为有定名词或无定名词,对关系代词的选择没有太大影响。此外,探讨了汉语有定名词和无定名词短语充当中心语时在从句中的句法功能和关系从句在主句中的句法功能,以及汉语指示代词和数量词位于关系从句前后位置的功能差异。发现汉语中指示词和数量词前置于关系从句是一种优势语序,是无标记的;而指/数量词后置于关系从句主要是为了特定的语用功能,如避免歧义或是突显中心语的动作或状态,因而是有标记的。

第六章剖析了英汉关系从句形式与功能之间的异同。以英汉关系从句中各自存在的三个争论焦点为假设,利用语料中的实例对其逐一进行验证。此外,考察了汉语关系从句的功能体现,指出汉语关系从句的基本功能是限定性的,具体表现为“确定所指”和“刻画概念”,但语境因素会对其限定性起到消减作用。汉语关系从句的限定性功能体现可以被视为是一个连续统。

第七章通过考察语料中英汉关系从句互译的情况,进一步剖析了英汉关系从句的差异,对前面章节中得出的结论进行了进一步验证。同时提出英汉关系从句互译的“无标记翻译策略”与“有标记翻译策略”。

第八章为结论。总结了本研究的主要内容,提出其创新之处。同时指出其中存在的不足以及今后的研究方向。

关键词: 关系化; 类型学; 限定性关系从句; 非限定性关系从句

Abstract

This dissertation, from the perspective of linguistic typology, makes a contrastive study on relativization in English and Chinese NPs (Noun Phrases). It focuses on studying the different relativization strategies, the similarities and differences between English and Chinese RCs (Relative Clauses) in syntax, semantic and pragmatic aspects, basing on the corpus of 738 instances of English RCs collected from two English novels and 1044 instances of Chinese RCs collected from four Chinese novels with the number of words totaling approximately 233,894. For convincing analyses, three different Chinese translation versions of the 738 English RCs and three different English translation versions of 738 Chinese RCs are included. Guided by the framework of functional analysis, three different arguments in English and Chinese RCs are respectively testified and the conclusions are examined in translation versions, and “unmarked translation strategy” and “marked translation strategy” are proposed as well.

The following major works are conducted:

The first chapter is the introduction. It gives a thorough literature review, especially the shortcomings in present studies. Then it illustrates the significance and the main points of this study, its theoretical framework and its materials.

The second chapter defines and classifies English and Chinese NPs. A semantic definition for RCs and the scope of this study are put forward. Indefinite noun phrases and NRC (non-restrictive relative clauses) in English and those taking verbs as the predicates or having complete syntactic structures in Chinese RCs are studied in this dissertation.

The third chapter makes a contrastive study on different relativization strategies in English and Chinese, basing on the previous research of linguistic typology. It is found that the major similarities between the two languages lie in that both adopt the gap strategy and the pronoun-retention strategy. The differences between them lie in that the gap strategy is found in the relativization

of Subject or Object in Chinese, which can be only used in DO(Direct object) and OBL(oblique) in English. And English takes the relative-pronoun strategy as the major strategy, which can not be found in Chinese. Furthermore, the main differences between the two lie in that there is an asymmetry in the relativization of Subject-modifying and Object-modifying genitive NPs in Chinese, while “whose” can be used in the relativization of Subject-modifying and Object-modifying genitive NPs in English.

The fourth chapter discusses the syntactic derivation of relative constructions in English and Chinese guided by the promotion theory of relativization of Vries(2002). It is testified that Liu Lijin’s view on the syntactic derivation of relative constructions in English and Chinese is convincing: English and Chinese relative clauses share the same derivational schema: both languages involve operator/empty operator movement and head noun-raising. The major difference between them exists that Chinese needs one final additional movement in deriving Chinese RCs remnant movement of the relative clause to Spec-DP to derive structure A or to a position between determiner and the head noun to derive structure B.

The fifth chapter focuses on the differences between English RCs and Chinese RCs in text. It is found that the number of definite noun phrases as the head noun in RCs is far higher than the indefinite noun phrases, and RRCs higher than NRCs, and the choice of relative pronouns has little concern with the nature of the head noun. It is also found that in Chinese, demonstratives and quantifiers used before the relative clause is a dominant order, and quantifiers put after the relative clause are to avoid ambiguity or to highlight the action or state of the head noun.

The sixth chapter analyzes the similarities and differences between forms and functions of English and Chinese RCs and testifies the different three arguments on English and Chinese RCs. It is found that the basic function of Chinese RCs is to specify the head noun and to characterize the head noun, while its functions can be decreased by contextual factors. The restrictiveness of

Chinese RCs can be seen as a continuum.

The seventh chapter makes a survey on English-Chinese translation versions and vice versa. It further verifies the conclusions obtained in the previous sections and attempts to propose the “unmarked translation strategy” and “marked translation strategy”.

The eighth chapter is the conclusion. It summarizes the main content, the significance of this study and points out its shortcomings and the relative field to do in the future.

Key words: relativization; typology; restrictive relative clause; non-restrictive relative clause