新世纪
学术新视野大系

Linguistic Borrowing:
A Sociopsychological
Perspective

语言借用与社会心理研究

陈 燕 著

Linguistic Borrowing: A Sociopsychological Perspective

语言借用与社会心理研究

陈　燕　著

厦门大学出版社

作者简介：

陈燕，1965年出生，湖北省天门市人。1986
年获复旦大学文学学士学位；1995年获厦门
大学文学硕士学位；2005年获厦门大学文学
博士学位。曾任教于江汉石油学院（现名长
江大学），现为厦门大学外文学院英语系副
教授、硕士生导师。从教十九年来，讲授过
英语精读、泛读、高级阅读、口语、写作、
词汇学、工具书、辞书与英语学习、英美辞
书研究等课程，主要从事汉英语言文化对比
研究以及双语词典编纂研究。已在《辞书研
究》、《外语与外语教学》、《英汉语比较
与翻译》等刊物发表学术论文十余篇。

序

　　陈燕在攻读博士学位期间,刻苦钻研,虚心求教,博览群书,不厌其烦,收集了国内外有关本专题的大量资料,建立了自己的语料库,进行了深入的调查研究,创建了自己的语言文化认同理论模式。作者以此作为博士论文的理论框架,探讨英语和汉语的词汇借用现象以及翻译中的异化策略,解释英语和汉语在借用词汇的方式上存在巨大差异的原因,以及异化翻译受制约的因素,并展望异化翻译的前景。认清这些问题,有助于揭示语言接触的某些规律,加深我们对语言变化现象的认识与理解,对双语语言、文化、翻译、外来语、词典编纂等方面研究有较大的理论意义和实用价值。这部论著就是陈燕的博士论文。

　　作者采用描写与解释相结合的方法,通过大量案例分析,从语言、历史、社会心理等多个角度探讨语言文化认同的性质、形成模式、建构缘由及作用,揭示语言文化认同在某些语言接触情形中对语言使用者的影响与制约,并着重对英汉语言中借用词汇的方式和异化翻译现象进行深入的分析和解释。本书立论新颖,论证合理,逻辑清晰,理论性强。

　　针对目前国内译界倡导异化翻译的热潮,作者指出在现代汉语中流行的一些欧化语法现象,着重分析有关学者主张异化翻译的重要理由,说明二十世纪二三十年代流行的欧化语法是当时倡导语文改革的译者和汉语学者出于对西方语言的严密性和逻辑性的极度推崇而大量引进的结果,是由当时的合法性语言文化认同促成的。随着欧化语法在现代汉语中的定型与发展,国人对外来语言文化成分的承受力增强,异化翻译受到欢迎。从目前译界和读者对外来语言文化成分的认同程度来看,异化翻译已成为一种趋势。人们对外来语言文化成分认同的内涵与二十世纪二三十年代相比,已发生了巨大的变化,即不再认为西方语言在词汇、表达法、语法等方面比汉语优秀,而是出于改革开放的国情、语言文化的频繁交流和对外来语言

文化成分的理解与尊重,主张在译文中尽可能保留外语语言文化的
"异国风味",但异化翻译是有限度的。异化翻译对汉语的影响将更
多地表现为向汉语输入新的表现法,语法层面的影响将是有限的。
这些论证都具有较强的说服力。

作者吸收哲学、社会学、社会心理学、社会语言学中有关认同的
理论,引用大量的语言历史材料,建构起语言文化认同的概念体系,
说明这一概念的内涵、动态特征、形成模式、建构的缘由与作用,并运
用语言文化认同这一假说分析具体的语言现象,揭示特定语言文化
的成员针对某种语言现象建构认同的机制以及认同形成后对该语言
文化成员产生的制约。作者突破从单一角度研究语言借用现象的老
路,结合语言变化的历史与当时的社会心理对语言现象进行分析与
阐释,拓展更为广阔的视角。另外,作者除采用传统的研究方法如举
例法、案例分析法之外,还运用了语料库的方法,对研究材料进行全
面的归纳与分析。作者采用跨学科的综合研究方法,描写与解释相
结合,不仅论其已然,而且论其所以然,不仅从语言的角度论证,而且
从社会历史和文化心理的角度论证,视角宽广,方法新颖,论证深刻,
与已有的相关文献相比,具有创新性。

我祝贺陈燕的博士论文得以出版,并期待她在英汉语言文化和
辞书编纂的理论研究方面取得更大的成绩。

连淑能
2005 年 5 月 20 日
于厦门大学外文学院

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to many people in many different capacities for making the completion of this doctoral dissertation possible.

First and foremost, I must acknowledge a special debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Lian Shuneng, for his encouragement with this project and for his detailed critical comments and invaluable suggestions on earlier drafts of this dissertation. I would like to thank him for his significant assistance both in sharpening and strengthening the focus of this work, and in pointing out inadequacies in the outline and the content. At every stage of the dissertation's progress I benefited from conversations with him on the notion of linguistic-cultural identity, and on the significance of research into issues of lexical borrowing and foreignizing translation. My greatest debt to Professor Lian is for his unusual patience, generous encouragement and expert guidance. The final version, however, with all its faults, including errors in my translation of all quotations from Chinese authors, is my responsibility alone.

My thanks also go to other professors who have taught me in various disciplines in the past five and a half years: Professor Yang Xinzhang, Professor Su Xinchun, and Dr. Marion Wyse. With their strong academic competence, they, together with my supervisor, are shining examples for me to emulate in scholarly research.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my colleagues in the Department of English at Xiamen University for their support during the writing of this dissertation. I am grateful to Professor Wu Jianping and Professor Hu Zhaoyun in particular for their insightful advice on earlier drafts of this work. I would like to thank my peer Ph. D. candidates,

too. Their understanding and support have been a constant source of confidence for me.

I am greatly indebted to my American friend, Professor Frances Clawson, for her constant encouragement and guidance from the beginning of the work. She has always been a highly valued source of inspiration and support to me in the past six years.

Finally, I wish to record my warm thanks to my husband, Chen Shoubin, and our son, Chen Yijia, who have had to put up with my reading or writing away on the computer instead of relaxing with them. Thanks to my nine-year-old son go hand in hand with a strong sense of guilt resulting from frequent refusals to play with him. Most of all, thanks to my husband whose unfailing love, moral and practical support have been constant and indispensable in my pursuit of the doctoral degree.

<div style="text-align: right;">Chen Yan</div>

Contents

Chapter One

General Introduction

1.1 Linguistic-cultural identity

1.1.1 Linguistic-cultural identity

Linguistic culture is "the set of behaviours, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language" (Schiffman 1996: 5), or in other words, "the sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, religious strictures, and all the other cultural 'baggage' that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their background" (ibid. : 276). The baggage that speakers bring to their dealings with language includes tangible linguistic baggage, i. e. , lexicon, both spoken and written, and intangible linguistic baggage like grammar and beliefs about and attitudes toward language, and the human body itself which makes both verbal and non-verbal communication possible. A speech community has belief systems about language (including literacy) in general and its language in particular (from which it usually derives its attitudes toward other languages). Schiffman (1996) in his monograph-length study, *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*, has examined linguistic culture in general and delineated various aspects of linguistic culture in three different polities — France, India, the USA — and shown how their language policies are grounded in linguistic culture. Therefore, linguistic culture is

not an arbitrary fiction but an important theoretical construct that contributes to the study of language and culture.

Identity defines the relationship between two or more related entities, i. e. , individuals or groups of people, in a manner that asserts a sameness or equality. Identity as "sameness" is a relative concept, the conceptual elements of which include numerical identity, qualitative identity, and uninterrupted continuity. An individual has acquired an identity, either because he has made conscious efforts to identify himself as belonging or not belonging to a group, or because he has characteristics particular to a group although he has not consciously endeavored to appear so. Linguistic-cultural identity, as used in this dissertation, means that members of a linguistic culture exhibit a sameness that is mainly seen in their consensus about language and linguistic behavior. When members of a language or speech community construct meaning on the basis of their common linguistic culture, they display common features particular to their linguistic culture, no matter whether consciously or unconsciously. Linguistic-cultural identity conditions and constrains the members in their reaction to linguistic stimuli (i. e. , stimuli concerned with language) in predictable ways, and the dominant linguistic-cultural identity of a language community determines the direction the language is going.

There are some basic patterns in the formation of linguistic-cultural identities. Individual linguistic-cultural identity occurs in the earliest phase of linguistic-cultural identity building and serves as the starting point of linguistic-cultural identity at a collective level. Collective linguistic-cultural identity helps perpetuate in the linguistic culture modifications initiated by an individual. Judged from the object of identification, speakers can attain a linguistic-cultural identity on the basis of their native language or a language originally alien to them. Native linguistic-cultural identity is readily attainable when there is no intervention from outside or from power apparatuses that forces the speakers to acquire an additional language or to abandon their mother tongue. In

,

multilingual settings, it is also likely that speakers choose to give up their mother tongue, manage to identify themselves with speakers of a foreign language, and eventually attain a foreign linguistic-cultural identity. If speakers identify with a linguistic culture out of their own will, they are said to have acquired a linguistic-cultural identity voluntarily, the opposite of which is imposed linguistic-cultural identity by institutional enforcement. Each and every linguistic-cultural identity is attained for reasons specific to the language and linguistic culture, but speakers are subject to two major factors in linguistic-cultural identity building process: prestige and power relations.

Some language contact phenomena can result from any of the three origins of linguistic identity building: legitimizing linguistic-cultural identity, resisting linguistic-cultural identity, and project linguistic-cultural identity. Legitimizing linguistic-cultural identity is introduced by the dominant institutions of society to extend and rationalize the domination of a language, thus promoting the building of a linguistic-cultural identity on the basis of that language. Resisting linguistic-cultural identity is generated by speakers whose language is devalued and/or even stigmatized by the logic of domination when they rise in resistance and fight for the survival of their language and linguistic culture. Project linguistic-cultural identity is initiated by speakers who, on the basis of conceptions of covert prestige attached to a new language, seek an overall transformation of the old linguistic culture by giving up their mother tongue and shifting to the new language. In countries where there are explicit language policies, legitimizing linguistic-cultural identity is a major factor operative in the successful implementation of language policies. In language contact situations, the dominated group can introduce a resisting linguistic-cultural identity that gives rise to language conflicts and that is likely to contribute to the maintenance of their language and linguistic culture. In language contact situations where there is no law requiring the abandonment of a given language, speakers of that language, on conceptions of projected gains associated with a new language, may attempt

a project linguistic-cultural identity that will cause language shift to the new language.

1.1.2   Borrowing and loanwords

1.1.2.1   Borrowing

Borrowing happens in language contact situations. Language contact is a phenomenon that introductory textbooks in linguistics usually devote a number of pages to, as is seen in Sapir (1921 ; 206-8) , Jespersen (1922 ; 208) , Bloomfield (1933 ; 470-503) , and Hocket (1958 ; 402). When different languages, as opposed to mere geographical or social varieties of the same language, come into contact, the languages involved may be affected in various ways. We shall follow Bynon (1977 ; 216) here in using the term contact "in a very wide sense, so as to include not only close geographical proximity but also trade relations and other types of cultural encounter of varying degrees of sophistication. The most superficial kind of language contact is probably that which exists between the producers or conveyors of some commodity and their clients in other language areas, and it is a well-documented fact of recent language history that the names of such objects of international trade as *tea*, *coffee*, or *tobacco* readily travel with them and become part of the consumers' language. At the other end of the scale the most intensive kind of contact may be said to exist in fully bilingual communities, and here not merely lexical items but even phonological and grammatical rules may come to be shared by the languages in question". It is essential for us to note, however, that contact cannot occur between languages by themselves; contact is conceivable only between speakers and speech communities.

Since few nations in the world are completely isolated, language contact becomes inevitable. As is pointed out by Sapir (1921 ; 205) , " [l] anguages, like cultures, are rarely sufficient unto themselves. The necessities of intercourse bring the speakers of one language into direct o╱indirect contact with those of neighboring or culturally dominant lan-

guages". Cultural contact, no matter how limited it is, always goes hand in hand with language contact.

When two languages come into contact on a large scale, bilingualism may become common if given favorable social conditions; other types of language contact phenomena are likely to arise, too, such as linguistic borrowing, code-switching, and interference. A further result in some cases may be the limitation of the use of one language to more restricted social contexts (e. g. , the home, neighborhood, and other informal interaction), even to the point of the obsolescence of the language in some communities, and ultimate complete language shift in the direction of the other language. In the ultimate stage of obsolescence, language death occurs. Still other language contact phenomena, namely pidginization and creolization, may result in the form of a new language in which the vocabulary is mainly derived from the prestige language and the grammar is considerably simplified. Such changes may be called macrolinguistic changes. On a more microlinguistic level, linguistic changes may be initiated by an individual or a small group, and subsequently imitated by others who attach social value to them, and even spread through an entire society.

In language contact situations, the communication between speakers of two different languages presupposes some minimum of bilingual mastery of the two languages. Whatever the degree or nature of contact between speakers of different languages is, it generally suffices to lead to, in the words of Sapir (1921: 205), "some kind of linguistic interinfluencing. " Linguistic interinfluencing can manifest itself in borrowing or interference or code-switching.

The word borrowing refers to the process that takes places when speakers of one language reproduce a pattern previously found in another. Some language researchers, like Cannon (1981; 1988) and Moody (1996), use the term "borrowing" to describe both the end product (e. g. , Chinese borrowings, Japanese borrowings) and the process itself. Still others, like Bloomfield (1933: 504-23), also use the term "borrowing" when discussing the spread of a linguistic expression among mutu-