TRANSLATION

翻译中的语段研究
—— 形合与意合的"字本位"视角

TRANSLATION

张军平 著

翻译中的语段研究

——形合与意合的"文本化"视角

张军平 著

外文出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

序

　　新年伊始,军平将外文出版社同意出版其博士论文的喜讯告诉我,并恳请代序。我欣然同意。作为导师,最幸福的事情莫过于看到自己的学生学有所成。

　　也许是出身军人家庭,加上又嫁给一名军人的缘故,军平衣着朴素,言语不多。初到上外,在众多的博士生中,你甚至很难注意到她的存在。经过三年的学习,这位极平凡的女学生却凭借其严谨踏实的作风和勤于钻研的精神让导师和同学牢牢记住了她。求学期间,她撰写的论文在上海外国语大学 2004 年度研究生学术文化节论文大赛中荣获一等奖。

　　军平的博士论文《翻译中的语段研究——形合与意合的"字本位"视角》颇具独创性。论文尝试以"字本位"为视角,以汉语"字"和英语"词"的对比为切入点,研究英汉两种语言在形合与意合表现法上的不同侧重,进而探究其在翻译中的体现,并对英语重形合、汉语重意合产生的内在动因做出了深入、独到的思考,从而在一定程度上改变了相关研究过于庞杂、且不够深入的状况。论文以语段为研究层面,使得形合与意合问题的三条研究途径(语法标记的转换、典型句式的调整、连接手段的变通)为语段研究提供了全新的思路,避免了单纯讨论语段作为翻译单位的合宜性所带来的局限性。军平在研究方法上重视实证性,

自行采集了大量语料,通过定性与定量分析相结合的方法,摆脱了以往研究中经验性论述过多的局面。

　　一篇博士论文的完成是心血和汗水的结晶,军平的博士论文更是如此。这本专著的出版既是军平三年博士生活的总结,也是她未来学术道路的起点。希望军平秉持刻苦钻研的精神,取得更多的学术成果!

<div style="text-align: right">

冯庆华

2007 年 7 月 30 日

于上海外国语大学

</div>

自　序

　　《翻译中的语段研究——形合与意合的"字本位"视角》是由我的博士论文修改而成的。2002 年 9 月我告别家人，踏入了上海外国语大学的校门，开始了三年攻读博士学位的生活。起初觉得这三年的生活是何等的漫长、艰苦与寂寞，没想到竟然一下倏地过去了，而自己也越发留恋这三年生活中的点点滴滴。

　　宿舍、图书馆、博士论文——这远远不是生活的全部。是我的导师，冯庆华教授，让我知道如何充实地把握三年求学的生活，如何在学术的道路上学会自立，如何在每时每刻的生活中学会做人。感谢先生，让我懂得过程远远比达到目标更重要。

　　三年中，先生谦虚的为人、严谨的治学态度、宽容细致的生活作风不仅让我景仰，也让我感动。"能够成为冯老师的学生是一件幸运的事"，初到上外，就常听学友对我说这样一句话。如今，我也要把它告诉给正在上外求学的我的师弟、师妹们。

　　完成一篇博士论文不是一件容易的事，有太多的人给予过我帮助。我要感谢上外的诸多教授，聆听他们的课程或讲座让我受益非浅，他们的治学方式给了我种种启迪。我要感谢我的丈夫，作为生活中的伴侣，是他给予我完成学业的勇气和信心。没有他的支持，也就不会有今天这篇博士论文的完成。我要感谢我的父母、我的姐姐和我的兄长，是他们给予我无微不至的关怀，他们的每一次电话都让我知道独自在外求学的我永远有家人的呵护。我要感谢我所有的朋友，是他们让我感受到又一种家的温暖。在上外的日子正是因为有了他们才变得更加精彩，更加令人难忘。没有朋友的日子，生活将是一口枯井，有了朋友，才会知道甘泉的浓冽。

　　我谨把此论文献给我爱的人和爱我的人，真诚地祝愿他们在生活的道路上一帆风顺！

摘　要

　　翻译活动涉及诸多方面,其中英汉两种语言在形合与意合表现法上的不同侧重及其在翻译中的体现是翻译研究的重要组成部分。奈达在 *Translating Meaning* 一书中指出,英语和汉语在语言学上极为重要的一个区别就是形合与意合的对比。因此,形合与意合无论是在英汉对比研究中,还是在翻译研究中都应被作为重点考虑对象。论文受"字本位"理论的启发并以此为视角,从英汉两种语言的基本结构单位出发,研究英汉在语段层面形合与意合的不同侧重,进而提出相应的翻译策略。

　　自王力先生在《中国语法理论》一书中提出"形合"与"意合"这两个概念以来,相关著述虽屡见不鲜,但过于庞杂,且相当一部分只是对形合与意合的外在表征进行罗列,没有深入发掘问题的本质。吕叔湘先生 1990 年在为《英汉对比研究论文集》所作的题词中说,"指明事物的异同所在不难,追究它们何以有这些异同就不那么容易了。而这恰恰是对比研究的最终目的。"故此,本文从"字"与"词"(word)的差异出发,旨在探讨英语重形合、汉语重意合的特点形成的内在动因。

　　这里首先要说明三个问题。第一,什么是"形合"与"意合"?这一对概念可以分别从广义和狭义上去认识。从广义上讲,"形合"指依借词汇和形态手段等外在逻辑形式来完成词语或语句之间的联结;"意合"则指不借助形式手段而通过语义或语句间的逻辑关系来实现词语或语句之间的联结。从狭义上讲,"形合"指通过词汇和形态手段,尤其是通过词汇手段实现句与句之间的联结;"意合"指通过语义或逻辑关系实现句与句之间的联结。论文中讨论的主要是狭义上的"形合"与"意合"。

　　第二,什么是"语段"?从形式上讲,语段由两个或两个以上的句子组成,大于句子而一般小于或等于段落;意义上,构成同一语

段的几个句子共同表述一个明确而完整的中心意思,具有语义向心性;逻辑上,语段内的各个句子之间具备逻辑上的关联性,构成一个连贯的语言片段。

我们在论文中把研究层面定位于语段,主要是出于以下两点考虑:一方面,语段兼具单句和语篇的优势,在分析和转换过程中既便于操作,又能够提供比较合理的语境;另一方面,从英汉语言基本结构单位的差异出发来研究形合与意合的途径同时为语段研究提供了新的视角。论文以"翻译中的语段研究——形合与意合的'字本位'视角"为题,力图在"'字本位'视角"、"形合与意合"、"翻译中的语段研究"之间构筑起三维空间,从而把个体研究转变为整体研究。

第三,什么是"字本位"? 汉语研究的"字本位"理论是 90 年代初提出的。与以往研究相比,这一理论的最大特点就在于它转换了研究者看待问题的角度,即不再以西语为起点,而是从汉语的实际情况出发,研究汉语的特点以及汉语与西语之间的差异。

"字本位"中的"本位"二字指的是"语言的基本结构单位"。一种语言的基本结构单位必需符合三条标准:第一,现成的,拿来就能用;第二,离散的,很容易和别的语言单位相区别;第三,在语言社团中具有心理现实性。字是"汉语的基本结构单位";英语中同样满足这三条标准的对应单位是"词"。

汉英两种语言在造字之初都是通过形来表意,但是在发展过程中经历了两种不同的取向:一个保持了与语义的统一;一个保持了与语音的统一。汉语的字和英语的词单独看起来微不足道,但作为语言基本结构单位,它们之间的差异却能反映语言整体结构的不同,这种差异也是导致汉语重意合、英语重形合的主要原因。

以汉英语言基本结构单位之间的差异为线索,将"英语重形合、汉语重意合"这一论断的具体表现进行梳理,就能够发现繁复的现象中所蕴涵的内部规律。鉴于以往关于形合与意合的研究多是建立在作者感性认识上的经验性论述,论文在进行相关研究时

重视实证性,采取了定性与定量相结合的方法。在以"字本位"为视角构筑起理论框架之后,我们在第四、五、六三章中或是采取自行收集语料,分析并得出结论的方法,或是借鉴已有的数据,对论文提出的观点进行证明,并提出切实可行的翻译策略。

在分析语料的过程中,我们采取了逐字逐句进行考察的方法,尽量做到用事实说话。论文认为,与仅凭感性认识摘取或引用几例来说明问题的方法相比,在对语料进行穷尽性分析的基础上得出的结论更具说服力。

论文第四章探讨了语段层面的形合与意合中语法标记的转换问题。语法标记属于语言形式,但语法标记的转换却不仅仅是形式上的问题。这样说有两方面的原因。一方面,语法形式与语法意义之间保持着密切的联系,语法形式的使用表明一定的语法意义,而特定的语法意义有时会赋形于某种语法形式;另一方面,在翻译过程中,由于很难找到英汉在语法标记之间的一一对应关系,对语法意义的辨析往往是语法标记得以转换的前提条件。

论文认为,语言基本结构单位的差异为解释英汉语法标记的不同提供了重要线索。在表达同样一个语义上比较复杂的概念时,英语和汉语由于语言基本结构单位的不同,必须选择不同的表达方式。英语的词由字母组成,可根据语法规则的需要向前或向后延伸;而字不具备可变性,方块形带来的是一种上下左右呈封闭性的结构,面对语法规则的需要,汉语经常要借助词汇表意功能补充形态表意功能的不足。

英语在表达语法意义时常用的语法标记是屈折性词缀,即在词干上添加粘着性语素从而起到一定的语法作用。相比之下,汉语中的词缀多为派生性。这就在一定程度上决定了汉语无法像英语一样通过形态变化系统来表示语法范畴,而常以词汇手段作为补充。

本章还着重讨论了翻译中复数标记的转换。英汉两种语言的名词都有数的概念,但是这一概念在两种语言中的体现方式却不

尽相同。根据所收集的语料,我们观察了翻译过程中复数标记的转换规律,总结出四种常用的转换手法,分别为:隐性标记手段的使用、原文表现手段的移植、词义虚化手法的使用和显性标记手段的使用,并进一步探讨了翻译中复数标记的缺席与意义的未定性。

第五章为"语段层面的形合与意合:典型句式的调整"。一种句式之所以能够称为典型,是因为其无论是在使用频率还是在使用范围方面较之其他句式都具有一定的突显性和代表意义。英汉两种语言就典型句式而言呈现出不同的特点。英语中具有这种典型性的句式是主谓结构。汉语中主谓结构和话题—说明结构各占相当一部分比重,而后者更能反映汉语句式的典型特点。

论文认为,英汉在典型句式方面的差异与语言基本结构单位的特点有密切关系。英语中的"词"具备形态变化,能够以此为纽带满足主谓间的一致关系与依存关系,而汉语中的"字"不具备形态变化,无法促成主谓之间的制约机制。因此汉语中的许多句子不能纳入主谓框架,取而代之的常常是话题—说明结构。所以,"字"与"词"(word)的差异直接反映出汉英在句子安排上一个侧重句意的完整,一个侧重形式的丰满,从而体现出汉语重意、英语重形的特点。

针对翻译中典型句式的调整,我们提出"结构:对应与转换"、"话题:突显与融合"以及"话题链:拆分与组合"三种翻译策略,并以《葬花吟》英译为例,分析了"主语"权衡与译文视角转换这一翻译中常见的问题。论文认为翻译过程中的"主语"问题不仅仅是增补与删略方法的选择,译者围绕"主语"进行的权衡除了可能使句子结构产生变化以外,有时甚至会影响到语段、乃至整个语篇视角的变化。

论文第六章仍从英汉语言基本结构单位的差异入手,结合语料的分析,观察英汉连接手段在实际使用中的不同之处。首先,比较英、汉语言基本结构单位,最显著的差别之一是前者重形、后者重义。这种重形与重义的表现之一就是,英语是遵照主谓提携机

制来扩展句子结构,其间由各种连接手段将词句连接起来,构筑起叠床架屋的发展框架。汉语语句的发展则多是靠意义贯穿,意尽语绝。

其次,相对于英语的词而言,汉语的字对现实具有较强的临摹性。在遣词造句时,汉语更注重实际事理语序,按照自然的"时序"和"事序"安排句子序列,在表达句内或句际的逻辑关系时常常省去连接成分。而英语在实际使用时,凭借其已颇具规模的连接手段,不拘泥于自然顺序,而是更加注重概念之间的逻辑关系在形式上的体现。因此,其对客观世界的描写具有相对的主观性与抽象性。

第三,英汉语言基本结构单位在形态上的差异也是造成连接手段不同的原因之一。汉字的方块形使其以拼接的方式组合在一起。如果说一个方块形的字代表了一个最小单位的意念,那么汉语由字向句段的扩展就成为意念之间的直接对接。与"字"相比,英语的"词"具有伸缩性。这种伸缩性在语句层面的反映就是,独立存在的语言单位经过连接手段的使用得到延伸,从而与其他语言单位连接在一起。如果我们用简单自然、流散铺排、似断若连这几个词来形容汉语语项之间的组合,英语就是通过自成系统的连接手段的使用,连点成线、由线到面。

在此基础上,论文对文学作品中英汉连接手段的使用频率进行了调查,在对数万字的语料进行分析之后所获取的数据证明,连接手段的使用反映出英语重形合、汉语重意合的特点。论文进一步总结了翻译过程中变通连接手段的几种情况,包括直译、显隐转换、结构调整、一词多译以及对标点符号的把握等,并关注了连接手段的缺省现象与误译。

最后,第七章对论文进行了总结。必须承认,形合与意合是相对的,而我们一直在讲的"英语重形合、汉语重意合"的规律也未必是恒久的。因为语言总是处在不断的发展与变化之中,语言的规律也是如此。就英语而言,其在历史发展过程中,经历了语法不断

弱化、语义不断显化的过程。而汉语的发展似乎是反方向的。总体上说,现代汉语中形合的比例高于古代汉语,意合低于古代汉语。

形合与意合的相对性既与语言的发展规律有关,同时又不能忽略使用者的主观倾向性。不同的作家可以通过不同的艺术构思和语言形式增加文学作品的趣味性和可读性,而题材、体裁也会对形合与意合造成一定的影响。论文以文学作品为主要研究对象,得出的结论和总结的规律也主要适用于文学作品。

根据这里提到的形合与意合的相对性,相关研究还可以进一步扩展。首先,研究形合与意合不仅应考虑语言系统的特点,同时还可以将它们可能具有的语用意义纳入考虑范围。其次,由于个人精力所限,论文的研究对象主要集中于文学作品。事实上,共时角度不同体裁文本之间的对比和历时角度相同体裁文本之间的对比在形合与意合方面都是值得研究的课题。第三,论文虽然试图用定量的数据说明定性的问题,但所收集的语料无论在范围上还是在规模上都有很大的局限性,因此建立相当规模的翻译语料库,编选不同时期、不同体裁、不同风格的语料无疑能够拓宽我们的视野,使我们的研究更加客观、公正。

关键词:语段;形合;意合;"字本位"理论;语言基本结构单位

ABSTRACT

Research projects in the different emphases of English and Chinese on hypotaxis and parataxis are indispensable to translation studies. And it is generally agreed that parataxis is one of the most important features distinguishing Chinese from English with Chinese showing paratactic prominence and English hypotactic prominence, as pointed out by Nida in *Translating Meaning*. Therefore, in translation studies or contrastive linguistics, research on hypotaxis and parataxis should be given due attention. Inspired by the character-center theory, the present dissertation looks at this feature in the light of the differences between the basic structural units of Chinese and English at the sentence group level and proposes relevant translation strategies.

Ever since Wang Li put forward the concepts of "hypotaxis" and "parataxis", a good many books and papers have been seen on this topic. However, most of them did not carry out a systematic study or failed to conduct a thorough exploration—they only listed the external features of hypotaxis and parataxis. Lv Shuxiang, a highly-esteemed Chinese grammarian, said in 1990 that what is difficult is not the identification of the similarities and differences between languages but the clarification of the exact reasons for such similarities and differences, and the latter is the ultimate aim of contrastive studies. It is in pursuit of this aim that the author sets about identifying the internal causes of why English is hypotaxis-prominent while Chinese parataxis-prominent through looking closely at the differences between the "character" in Chinese and the "word" in English.

Before the introduction of the major chapters in the dissertation, three points have to be made. First, what are "hypotaxis" and "para-

taxis"? This pair of concepts are to be dealt with in two aspects. In the broad sense, "hypotaxis" refers to the way in which language units such as words, phrases and sentences are connected by the overt lexical and grammatical, especially inflectional devices; "parataxis", on the other hand, indicates that the connection is realized by the semantic meaning or logical relation existing covertly between language units. In the narrow sense, both "hypotaxis" and "parataxis" are defined in the same way as those in the broad sense, except that the connection is restricted to that between sentences. This dissertation, taking sentence groups as the level at which relevant research can be conducted, focuses on "hypotaxis" and "parataxis" in their narrow sense.

Second, what is a "sentence group"? This concept is often brought up in the studies of Chinese and Chinese translation theories. Studies on this aspect are more popular in China than in the West. A sentence group must have three characteristics. In respect of form, it is composed of not less than two sentences, hence a unit larger than a sentence and smaller than or equal to a paragraph; in respect of meaning, the sentences together express a clear and complete idea and thus contribute to the thematic unity of the whole sentence group; in respect of logic, all the sentences within the group are closely connected with one another, making the passage a coherent one.

There are two reasons why this dissertation takes sentence groups as its level of research. On one hand, a sentence group bears the characteristics of both the sentence and the text. Shorter than a text in most circumstances, a sentence group is easy for analysis; longer than a sentence, it provides the necessary context with which reasonable assumptions could be made. On the other hand, the three aspects of hypotaxis and parataxis that are analyzed in this dissertation, that is, the transfer of grammatical markers, the restructuring of typical sentence patterns,

and the adaption of conjunctive devices, offer a new approach to the study of sentence groups. With the title "The Study of Sentence Group in Translation—'Hypotaxis' and 'Parataxis' Viewed from the Character-center Theory", the dissertation attempts to build a three-dimensional framework based on the character-center theory, hypotaxis and parataxis as well as the sentence group studies in translation, in this way realizing the change from an independent research to a joined one.

The third point that should be mentioned is what a character-center theory is. A branch in Chinese studies, this theory was put forward in the 1990s. Compared with past studies, its priority lies in its taking a pioneering research perspective. In other words, the advocates of the theory do not follow the western ways of studying grammar in the study of Chinese. Instead, they look at Chinese as it is by concentrating on its own characteristics before comparing it with western languages.

In the character-center theory, the Chinese character functions as the basic structural unit. To fulfill this function, this basic unit has to conform to the three standards of ready-madeness, discreteness and psychological reality of a language community. That is to say, a basic structural unit can be directly used in written or spoken language, and easily distinguished from the other language units. Moreover, its importance has been mutually agreed with and widely acknowledged by language users. It is because of these considerations that "character" is taken as the basic structural unit of Chinese, and its counterpart in English, "word", also meets the above three standards.

As the basic structural units, both the character in Chinese and the word in English made their semantic content salient by means of forms at the earliest stage. It is only in the course of development that they went off in different directions. The former, still belonging to the ideographical writing system, adheres to its function of symbolic repre-

sentation of ideas; the latter, however, has given up this function and tends to be more and more closely connected with sound in a way that letters are used to indicate pronunciation. Small and seemingly negligible as they are, their differences reflect the discrepancies of the overall language structures between English and Chinese. And these differences are a major reason for the paratactic prominence in Chinese and the hypotactic prominence in English.

Following these differences, we are in a better position to sort out the various manifestations of hypotactic prominence and paratactic prominence, and discover the inherent laws working behind these miscellaneous phenomena.

In view of the fact that many of past research projects were based upon those authors´perceptual knowledge, this dissertation, in supporting its arguments, combines qualitative and quantitative approaches. With the establishment of the theoretical framework, the author conducts an empirical study on the basis of materials or data either extracted from what has been obtained by the authorities in relevant fields or collected from literary works by the author herself. In the latter case, it is up to the author to analyze the first-hand materials according to which conclusions are drawn or translation strategies are proposed.

While processing the materials and data, the author spares no efforts in going through them word by word, trying to allow facts to speak for themselves. This dissertation believes that conclusions drawn on the basis of an exhaustive study are more convincing than those proved by just a few examples either frequently cited or chosen purposefully by the author.

Chapter four, five and six are further elaboration of the theoretical framework. In chapter four, the dissertation discusses the first aspect of hypotaxis and parataxis—the transfer of grammatical markers at the lev-

el of sentence groups. Grammatical markers belong to language forms, the transfer of which, however, is not simply a matter of form. For one reason, there is a close connection between grammatical form and grammatical meaning. For the other, the analysis of grammatical meaning is the prerequisite for the transfer of grammatical forms. A one-to-one correspondence is rarely seen between the grammatical markers of English and Chinese. More often than not it has to be broken when grammatical markers are translated from English to Chinese.

How can the discrepancies of grammatical markers between Chinese and English be explained? The differences between the basic structural units shed light on the answer. Special in shape, the character in Chinese, when created, expresses meaning with the help of the very pictorial form of itself. With its development, the degree of the pictorial representation of ideas is much more lessened, yet the square shape of a Chinese character is further consolidated and strengthened. Therefore, when conveying semantically complex concepts, English and Chinese, due to the discrepancies in their basic structural units, have to select different means of expression. Composed of letters, the word in English could lengthen according to the requirement of grammatical rules via affixation. While the Chinese character, confined to its square shape, is not as flexible as the English word. Therefore, confronted with the same grammatical requirements, Chinese has to use lexical devices to make up for its lack of morphological forms.

In many circumstances, the grammatical markers that English employs in expressing grammatical meaning are inflections, that is, the fulfillment of grammatical function by adding affixes. In contrast, most of the affixes in Chinese are derivative ones, which, to some degree, renders Chinese incapable of clarifying the grammatical categories by morphology. Unlike English, it has to turn to lexical devices as a