

侯国金 著

*Our date, my love, is rare,*

*And our 'goodbye' bitter,*

*Lilies and roses all wither*

*In pale breeze Oriental.*

*Lo! Silkworms! Spinning*

*Love webs till there's breath little;*

*Candles on mine table sobbing*

*O'er their body tears crystal.*

*At early morn, my love, thou art sitting*

# PRAGMATIC MARKEDNESS THEORY AND APPLICATION

## New Approach to Translation Evaluation

*long and long, blue about a wrinkle.*

*thou sing again that long love song*

*melancholy, under the moon ice-pale.*

*the trip to thy home, my love, is long;*

*take my love to my love, Nightingale.*

— Translated from Li Shangyin's *Wu Ti* by Hou Guojin

# 语用标记 理论与应用

翻译评估的新方法



四川大学出版社

侯国金 著

*Our date, my love, is rare,*

*And our 'goodbye' bitter,*

*Lilies and roses all wither*

*In pale breeze Oriental.*

*Lo! Silkworms! Spinning*

*Love webs till there's breath little;*

*Candles on mine table sobbing*

*O'er their body tears crystal.*

*At early morn, my love, thou art sitting*

Y  
H315-P  
33

# 语用标记 理论与应用

翻译评估的新方法

PRAGMATIC  
MARKEDNESS  
THEORY AND  
APPLICATION



A New Approach to  
Translation Evaluation

四川外语学院科研项目



四川大学出版社

责任编辑:黄新路  
责任校对:孟庆发  
封面设计:米茄设计工作室  
责任印制:杨丽贤

### 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语用标记理论与应用:翻译评估的新方法 / 侯国金著.  
成都:四川大学出版社, 2005.3  
ISBN 7-5614-3081-7

I. 语... II. 侯... III. 英语-翻译-语用学-研究  
IV. H315.9

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2005) 第 054164 号

### 书名 语用标记理论与应用:翻译评估的新方法

---

作 者 侯国金 著  
出 版 四川大学出版社  
地 址 成都市一环路南一段24号(610065)  
发 行 四川大学出版社  
印 刷 郫县犀浦印刷厂  
成品尺寸 140 mm×202 mm  
印 张 10  
字 数 243 千字  
版 次 2005 年 3 月第 1 版  
印 次 2005 年 12 月第 2 次印刷  
定 价 26.00 元

◆读者邮购本书,请与本社发行科  
联系。电话:85408408/85401670/  
85408023 邮政编码:610065

◆本社图书如有印装质量问题,请  
寄回出版社调换。

◆网址:www.scupress.com.cn

---

版权所有◆侵权必究



## 作者简介

侯国金（生于1963年2月），男，湖北大冶人，汉族，四川外语学院外国语言研究所副教授，硕士生导师。1992年获得湖北大学“英语教学”硕士学位，2004年获得上海外国语大学语用学博士学位，2004年至2006年在复旦大学中文系博士后流动站做博士后研究。研究领域为语用学，旁涉语义学和翻译学。发表“语用含糊的标记等级和元语用意识”等论文50余篇，出版《新世纪英语教学理论与实践》等著作20余部，在报刊上发表散文15篇。获得湖北省“教书育人奖”及上外“科研成果一等奖”等多种奖项。现为《英语研究》编委、中国语用学研究会会员。

通讯地址：重庆市沙坪坝区

四川外语学院外国语言学研究所

邮政编码：400031

E-mail: jennyzjok@sohu.com

—— 献给何兆熊教授

## Acknowledgements

This book (dissertation) of mine, as the title indicates, is an interdisciplinary investigation of communication. So, it is no doubt an attempt of marrying Pragmatics to the science and art of Translation with no little borrowing of ideas from established linguistics literature, especially the Markedness Theory founded by N. S. Trubetzko and Roman Jakobson; from Pragmatics literature, though little is found with the designation of *Pragmatic Markedness*; and of course from Translation theories that have been thriving in the last three decades. The completion of this work is not imaginable without the authors of works I directly or indirectly learn, borrow and quote from, most of which can be found in the BIBLIOGRAPHY for acknowledgement.

I would like to give special thanks to Professor He Zhaoxiong, my supervisor. With a strong expertise in Pragmatics, which he has been teaching much of his teaching career, and a broad vision of Semantics and General Linguistics, he has cast a tremendous influence on me in the formation of my linguistic philosophy, and notably, the brainstorming, formulation, and composition of this book. Meeting him in his office about any 'original' works of mine (namely, small papers) and any part of this works is a joy of enlightenment and encouragement. My outline for the thing and ideas were discussed there many times, each section demonstrating his professionalism, thus bringing me some new horizon, which results in improvement of some extent.

In the Pragmatics lessons meant for MA candidates of

Shanghai International Studies University which I took, I was able to renew my earlier Pragmatics intake, and build up some insightful thoughts about a couple of issues of the discipline, especially the core thereof, namely, Deixis, Context, Implicature, Speech Act, and Presupposition. Inspired by his teaching and small private talks (again in his office) I wrote a number of articles contributed to domestic journals of academics. About this book again, Professor He values, and asks me to value also two things, namely ORIGINALITY and SOUNDNESS, which I have tried hard to approach.

In this school and the 'school' of Pragmatics of China, Professor He is known for his knowledge, ability, teaching competence, English speaking and writing style, kindness, strictness and cool humor, and I am happy to say all this sunshine has showered upon me during my three years of doctorate pursuit, which paves the way for a post-doctorate course in Fudan University and future research. If I came to SISU in 2001 to *dig new ground*, it is Professor He that let me know what *new ground* to *dig* and how to do it.

I am also indebted to Professor Mei Deming for his formal lectures which I attended and his casual instruction about many a topic, for example, about the semantic multitude of the Chinese word *kaoshi* (test/examine). My thanks also go to Professor Feng Qinghua, whose works and words, as well as his ways of doing translation and things, mean a good deal to me. Professor Shu Dingfang has given me big encouragement as well as inspiration by lectures and private talks; therefore he deserves my indebtedness.

Then mention ought to be made of my colleagues, Hong Gang, Wang Xiangfeng, Liao Qiaoyun, and Li Huadong, to name but a few. I delighted extraordinarily in and benefited more or less from reading their works and chatting with them. Our school librarians also rate some commendation for updating the library resources and smiling at my intrusion. Then, I want to thank He Wenzhong and Zhou Zhiyong for tackling my computer problems. Finally I owe a huge debt to my wife Rose who bravely shouldered all the housework of the *Hou's*, if not all our kids' homework, during the three years of my Ph. D. learning, and to my children, Denice and Fannet, who have been good kids at home and good pupils at school and thereby have saved us a lot of trouble and dollars (they earned a pile of prizes!).

Finally I must thank the authors of papers and books, strongly or weakly relevant to this study, which I have read and benefited and quoted from for this book and whose names and works, for the number is not small, cannot be listed here but mostly available in the BIBLIOGRAPHY. (For revision and thanks to more, please see Postscript at the end of the book.)



# 序

王寅

(一)

面对侯国金博士这本书稿，我感到十分欣喜，由衷地为这位年轻后生感到高兴。他既对标记理论做出了一定的发展，而且还能巧妙地将这一发展与翻译理论紧密地结合起来，尝试运用语言学中的标记理论来量化、验证译文质量，这确实是一大创新。为这样的作品作序，值得！

记得去年我们在组织中国第十届当代语言学研讨会时，侯国金受蒋勇委托在大会上宣读他的论文。筹委会安排给侯国金的发言时间为 15 分钟，而蒋勇的稿件长达 20 多页。我那时还有点担心，他能否在如此短的时间内将这长篇小说的核心思想在大会上陈述清楚。后来他不仅完成了任务，而且还完成得很出色——一口流利的英语，带有几分幽默的表述，给与会代表留下了十分深刻的印象。实践证明我的担心多余了。

原以为他是专长于语用学理论研究的，与他数次交谈之后，我才感觉到他的知识面较宽。这次阅读了他的书稿，不仅证实了我原来的感觉，而且也加深了我对他的了解。这本书稿涉及了语言学领域中许多分支学科的知识，如普通语言学、语法学、语义学、语用学、翻译理论、语言哲学等，表现出他对这些知识有较为深刻的理解。值得称道的是，他还能在理解的基础上做到有所发展和创新，如本书对标记理论、等效翻译理论等都提出了自己的见解。更难能可贵的是，他还将这些知识融会贯通地糅合在一起，提出了独特的翻译评估新方法——语用标记等效原则，这正

体现出当前学术界所倡导的一种风气：创新。

此时，我对这位后生有了更为全面的了解：始于认真读书，打下扎实的理论基本功；善于思考问题，不断审视现有观点；发现理论空白，并着力寻求填补空白的途径；依赖较宽的知识面，从跨学科研究角度出发，提出解决问题的有效办法。侯国金就这样踏上了认认真真读书，踏踏实实做学问的学海之路，可贺！

## (二)

如何对语用学进行量化分析，如何将语用学与其他学科结合起来研究，如何对翻译标准进行定量表述，本书在这些方面做出了十分可喜的尝试，并将这三个问题整合起来进行综合研究，取得了令人满意的成果。

我们知道，语言量化分析历来是个难题，译文量化分析更是难中之难。国内外虽有不少学者对其进行尝试，但总有隔靴搔痒的感觉，令人感到不着边际。与其难以全面量化，不如择其一点作为突破口。侯国金在本书中能基于约 12 个项目，对不同译文进行语用标记定量分析，设计出语用标记价值和等效得分计算对照表，建立出一套全新的译文质量量化评估方案，而且具有较高的可操作性，这多多少少使得我们搞语言认知研究的人，认识到语言的形式化分析还是可以做到的，定量分析也自有其可行之道。

随着各学科的深入发展，跨学科研究已成为一种势在必行的趋势。侯国金也顺应了这一趋势，依托深广的语言理论知识，驾轻就熟地将语用学标记理论运用于翻译实践之中，不仅找到了语言理论与实践应用的接口，而且也为翻译提供了一个更为科学的量化分析方案，进一步丰富了翻译理论。

侯国金设计出“语用标记等效值算法”[NEV: Numerical (pragmatic markedness) Equivalence Value] 及其 12 条准则，可分别对两个或多个译文的选词、结构、修辞、否定、含义、文

风等标记性参数逐一进行评估。与原文的语用标记值等效时，分数就高（满分 10 分）；不等效时，分数就低，最后计算出总得分，有效评出译文的优劣。如此即可对译文和原文的标记性参数进行 NEV 评估和对比。如：选词方面原文若为  $[M^-]$ ，甲译文若为  $[M^- \text{ 至 } M^{++}]$ ，则最多可得 10 分，最低得 4 分；乙译文若为  $[M^-]$ ，这就与原文的标记价值相等，就可得 10 分。我认为：语用标记等效原则的译评方法，不仅具有理论价值，发展了前人（如奈达等）的等效理论，而且还具有实用价值，有利于我们更加客观地评价译文质量。

### （三）

侯国金平时讲话就很有条理，喜爱运用鲜活、幽默的语言。从本书中我们不难发现他厚实的语言功底。全书行文流畅，语言表达地道，这也与他对话言有较好的领悟有关。这样的领悟又促使他去更好地运用和翻译语言。如下面一个关于英语双关语翻译的例子，可看出他运思之巧妙：

A: What kind of **money** do girls like the most?

B: **Matrimony.**

甲：女孩子喜欢怎样致富？

乙：嫁大腕成妇人/收财礼变富婆。

双关语确实难译，不少学者发出如此的感叹，在碰到这类翻译时要么闻此而躲避，要么硬译遭败绩；而侯国金正是运用了语用标记理论，给这类幽默以“等效”处理（英语中的 *money* 与 *matrimony* 发音有类似之处，汉语的“富”与“妇”也有同音效果），大有令人赏心悦目之感。从此例的翻译可见，侯国金确实领悟了原文幽默之处，克服了翻译之难，译出了双关之妙。这是一次语用标记等效理论在翻译实践上的具体应用，使得英汉两种语言之间架起了异曲同效之桥梁。

(四)

这本书涉及领域较广，讨论颇为深入，对从事普通语言学、语法学、语义学、语用学、翻译理论、语言哲学、英汉对比等领域的人员都有较高的参考价值。

但是，“语用标记”的研究，正如作者自己在“总结”里所说还有不少有待深入探索的空间，很多问题仍需认真思考，有些论点尚需借用其他语言学科的理论来加以进一步论证、补充和发展。这是因为，将语用理论运用于翻译是一片崭新的天地，任何片面尝试都不可能一蹴而就。

我认为，更为重要的是，作者应尽快将这一研究成果推广应用于翻译评判之中，为翻译界送去一股新风。

同时，该项研究还可进一步与计算机科学结合起来，可考虑设计出能应用计算机评判识别标记性参数的软件。这样，该理论因其可操作性和实用性，就更值得全面推广了。同时，该理论在应用中也将会得到进一步完善。

是为序。

2005年6月6日

于四川外语学院认知科学研究所

## A List of Abbreviations and Symbols

- A — agent/adjective/numeral  
Adj — adjective  
Adv — adverb/adverbial  
Attr — attributive  
Aux — auxiliary (verb)  
BP — Banter Principle  
C — complement  
CP — Cooperative Principle  
DE — dynamic equivalence  
FE — functional equivalence  
FEP — Functional Equivalence Principle  
FST — Face Saving Theory  
H — hearer  
HP — humor principle  
iff — if and only if...  
IFID — illocutionary force indicating device  
[M] — marked (in contrast to [U], not indicating markedness degree)  
[M<sup>+</sup>] — moderate markedness; moderately marked  
[M<sup>++</sup>] — strong markedness; strongly marked  
[M<sup>-</sup>] — weak markedness; weakly marked  
N — noun  
NEV — numerical (pragmatic markedness) equivalence value  
O — object  
P — patient

A List of Abbreviations and Symbols

- PM — pragmatic markedness
- PMEP — pragmatic markedness equivalence principle
- PP — Politeness Principle; present participle; past participle
- Pred — predicate
- Pron — pronoun
- RP — Relevance Principle
- RT — Relevance Theory
- S — speaker/subject
- SL — source language
- ST — source text
- TL — target language
- TT — target text; translation (text); (the) translated version
- [U] — unmarked; utterance
- U — utterance; unmarked
- U/M — Unmarked/Marked (distinction)
- V — verb
- ^ — theme-rheme separation signal
- ? — unsure, probably unacceptable, most probably unacceptable
- \* — most probably unacceptable

## Abstract

This book is a tentative study of translation equivalence based upon Markedness Theory, highlighting our Pragmatic Markedness Equivalence Principle (PMEP), which is a new approach to translation evaluation. The entire book is made up of 7 chapters, the first 5 dealing with linguistic and pragmatic markedness, Chapter 6 elucidating our principle and its evaluative power as demonstrated in the NEV comparisons of two or more translation versions.

In this world of somewhat asymmetrical symmetry, usual, common, first learned, easily accessible, expectable entities and their corresponding expressions are unmarked items/terms ([U]), while unusual, uncommon, later learned, inaccessible, unexpected things and their sayings are called marked items/terms ([M]).

Supposing the processing effort (X) for the interpretation of an utterance is N, then,

- 1 if X equals (=) default value (N), then utterance is unmarked ([U]), easy to process;
- 2 if X almost equals ( $\approx$ ) N, utterance is weakly marked ([M<sup>-</sup>]), not hard to process;
- 3 if X is bigger or smaller than (>/<) N, utterance is moderately marked ([M<sup>+</sup>]), a little hard to process;
- 4 if X is much bigger or much smaller (>+/ $\leq$ +) than N, utterance is strongly marked ([M<sup>++</sup>]), hard to process.

Eugene A. Nida's Dynamic/Functional Equivalence (Principle) (FEP) has been influential ever since the 1960s. Equivalence, in spite

Abstract

of the term, does not mean equality or identicalness of meaning, but approaching sameness or nearness of function or effect. We believe in FEP, though we find space for improvement.

The highest standard for our PMEP is a full representation of the ST in markedness value, in M-Term numbers and degrees so that TT is read by TT readers in the same manner as ST is read by ST readers. This standard, like Nida's, is but an ideal, as explained by the 12 Axioms of PMEP (see 6.2) and the following pragmatic-markedness equivalence model (ibid.):

**Pragmatic-Markedness Equivalence Model**

ST	Ideal TT	Fair TT	Poor TT	Worst TT
U	U	M <sup>-</sup>	M <sup>+</sup>	M <sup>++</sup>
M <sup>++</sup>	M <sup>++</sup>	M <sup>+</sup>	M <sup>-</sup>	U

Section 6.7 is designed to demonstrate how the PMEP can be used in the comparison of two versions (we draw upon 杨宪益 & 戴乃迭 and J. Minford) of the translation of Chapter 110 of *The Story of the Stone* by 曹雪芹 & 高鹗, macroscopically in terms of a) Word-Class and Syntactic U/M Opposition, b) Negation and Markedness, c) Pragmatic U/M Opposition — Speech Act and (Pragmatic) Principles, and Indirectness. To be specific (at the sacrifice of brevity perhaps), our comparison should cover all M-Value Parameters (M-Parameters) like PRINTING, WORDING, ADDRESS TERM, TOPICALITY (part of STRUCTURE), NEGATION (part of STRUCTURE), STRUCTURE, IMPLICATION, (PRAGMATIC) PRESUPPOSITION, POLITENESS, RHETORIC (part of INDIRECTNESS), VAGUENESS (part of INDIRECTNESS),



INDIRECTNESS, and so on and so forth, so long as they count in the evaluation of M-Value of TT. The following table serves as illustration: The ST column is supposedly found with a certain text that is translated; the TT<sub>1</sub> column is assumed to be the M-Values and then its NEV calculation of a certain translation version, whilst the TT<sub>2</sub> column is the M-Values and then NEV calculation of another translation.

**Calculation of Numerical Equivalence Value (NEV)  
of (Any) Two Translations**

	ST	TT <sub>1</sub> (points)	TT <sub>2</sub> (points)
WORDING	[U]	[M <sup>+</sup> ] 6	[M <sup>++</sup> ] 4
ADDRESS TERM	[M <sup>-</sup> ]	[M <sup>+</sup> ] 8	[M <sup>++</sup> ] 6
STRUCTURE	[M <sup>+</sup> ]	[M <sup>+</sup> ] 10	[U] 6
RHETORIC	[M <sup>+</sup> ]	[U] 6	[M <sup>++</sup> ] 8
NEGATION	[U]	[M <sup>+</sup> ] 6	[M <sup>+</sup> ] 6
IMPLICATION	[M <sup>++</sup> ]	[M <sup>+</sup> ] 8	[U] 4
PRESUPPOSITION	[M <sup>+</sup> ]	[U- M <sup>-</sup> ] 6-8	[M <sup>-</sup> ] 8
PRELIMINARY TOTAL		50-52	42
COMPENSATION VALUE		+30	+30
ERROR DEDUCTION		-1	-2
STYLE DEDUCTION	7 Items	7 U/M Items -0	10 U/M Items -4
FINAL TOTAL		79-81	66

Our inference is that TT<sub>1</sub> is more equivalent to ST, thus better than TT<sub>2</sub>.