

外 教 社

牛津英汉双解百科分类词典系列

Oxford

CONCISE DICTIONARY OF  
**LINGUISTICS**  
WITH CHINESE TRANSLATION

牛津英汉双解  
语言学词典



**W** 上海外语教育出版社  
SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

牛津英汉双解百科分类词典系列

Oxford Concise Dictionary of

# Linguistics

with Chinese Translation

牛津英汉双解

语苏工堂学院图书馆

藏书章

P. H. Matthews 原编

杨信彰 编译



上海外语教育出版社  
SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

牛津英汉双解语言学词典 / 杨信彰编译. — 上海:  
上海外语教育出版社, 2006  
(牛津英语百科分类词典英汉双解版)  
ISBN 7-5446-0179-X

I. 牛… II. 杨… III. 语言学-双解词典-英、汉  
IV. H316-61

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2006)第 085376 号

© Oxford University Press and Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press 2006

This edition is published under licence from Oxford University Press for sale in the Mainland part of the People's Republic of China only.  
本词典由牛津大学出版社授权出版, 限在中华人民共和国大陆境内销售。

*Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics* was originally published in English in 1997. This Translation is published by arrangement with Oxford University Press.

《牛津语言学词典》英语原版 1997 年出版, 此英汉双解版由牛津大学出版社授权出版。

**图字: 09-2005-385**

出版发行: **上海外语教育出版社**

(上海外国语大学内) 邮编: 200083

电 话: 021-65425300 (总机)

电子邮箱: bookinfo@sflep.com.cn

网 址: <http://www.sflep.com.cn> <http://www.sflep.com>

责任编辑: 章骏德

---

印 刷: 上海叶大印务发展有限公司

经 销: 新华书店上海发行所

开 本: 787×960 1/32 印张 17.75 字数 630 千字

版 次: 2006 年 11 月第 1 版 2006 年 11 月第 1 次印刷

印 数: 3 100 册

---

书 号: ISBN 7-5446-0179-X / H · 0070

定 价: 33.00 元

本版图书如有印装质量问题, 可向本社调换

# 《牛津英汉双解语言学词典》

编辑出版人员

英语原版编者: P. H. Matthews

英汉双解版编译者: 杨信彰

策划编辑: 张春明

责任编辑: 章骏德

封面设计: 王中维

版式设计: 章骏德

## 出版说明

我社自 1999 年开始陆续出版牛津百科分类词典英语版,迄今已出版近 40 种。这批百科词典深受广大专业人员、英语学习者的欢迎。同时,部分读者要求我们出版该套词典的英汉双解版,以更好地满足读者学习、翻译的需要。为此,我社经过充分调研和论证,并同牛津大学出版社协商,从该系列中挑选出 9 种,组织有关专业人员编译成英汉双解版。双解版的 9 种分别是经济学、商务、金融与银行、计算机、会计、数学、物理学、语言学以及英语语法。

英汉双解版保留了英语原版的全部内容,并提供英语术语的汉语译名。书后附汉英术语对照表,旨在帮助读者集中学习专业词汇和从事汉英翻译。

上海外语教育出版社

2006 年 9 月

## Introduction 序

This is a 'concise dictionary' and it is 'of linguistics'. What should such a book be like and what should it include?

Linguistics is defined in general dictionaries as 'the science of language' or 'the scientific study of language'. In the more cautious wording of *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, it is 'the branch of knowledge that deals with language'. But although it is the only academic discipline that deals with language alone, and there are aspects of language that it alone is concerned with, its practitioners cannot claim a monopoly of the whole of their subject matter. A range of other disciplines, from the study of literature to computer science, deal with language in one way or another, and the boundaries between them and linguistics are not fixed. It would indeed be a pity if they were. How far into these should the entries in this dictionary go?

Let us start from the centre and work outwards. Everyone will agree that grammar, in a wider or narrower sense, is part of linguistics; in its widest sense, it includes both the study of the structure of words and of syntactic constructions, and that of sound systems. In the second half of the twentieth century these fields have seen an explosive development of technical theory, and a great deal of this dictionary is taken up with it. Everyone will agree that linguistics is concerned with the lexical and grammatical categories of individual languages, with differences between one type of language and another, and with historical relations within families of languages. These are potentially bottomless pits, and strict limitations are needed to avoid falling into them; but I hope I have included what users will judge to be important. Many languages are both spoken and written, and although the nature and history of writing systems are not always covered in university courses in linguistics, it is hard to see in what other dictionary one might expect to look them up. Apart from the details of individual systems and the technicalities of their description, there are also issues of general theory that belong to linguistics alone; that of change in language is one of them. But beyond this there are problems, and it has to be acknowledged that in a number of cases, involving both single entries and classes of entry, I could have decided differently.

Should I, for example, have included entries for parsing strategies in computational linguistics? The name of this field suggests that it is a branch of linguistics and certainly, once upon a time, it was. But it has increasingly become a part of computer science, addressing problems of its own that do not bear, and

quite properly are no longer claimed to bear, on the nature of language as such. I have therefore asked myself whether someone whose interests are centred on the topics that linguists must know about is any poorer, as a linguist, for not knowing this field as well, and, after some soul-searching, have drawn in my net accordingly. The same test has been applied to other aspects of language or speech processing, and to much of, for example, the traditional terminology of rhetoric. It also applies to the study of methods in language teaching, which, as part of what is conventionally called 'applied linguistics', again appears, at first sight, to belong to our subject. But we are past the days when this was seen as literally an application of linguistics, and linguists in general do not still expect to gain many insights from it. A further test was whether, in drafting an entry, the terms on which a definition would rest are themselves terms in linguistics or in a field that is clearly separate. A dictionary of linguistics cannot systematically include things that belong to computer science in general, or to acoustics, or to anatomy or physiology, or to general psychology or the social sciences, even when, as terms in neighbouring subjects, they are used by linguists in some branches of their own. But it would frustrate the reader if other entries were then to take them for granted. In some cases this has forced me to cut corners; something must be in and, even if its explanation has to be less precise than a technical definition would be, it may at least be possible for readers who need the relevant entry to get some help from it. In other cases even circumlocution has failed and, where the term is marginal, I have judged it safer to leave it out.

The need to cut corners was most pressing in some areas of phonetics and of semantics. Acoustics is not in general part of linguistics; nor, at least as I conceive it, are topics such as the anatomy of the larynx. But some specific terms in acoustics are, and the distinctions between different types of phonation, which is a hard enough topic in our present state of knowledge, might be made more precise if anatomical detail could be assumed. Philosophy and logic are not part of linguistics either, but the literature on semantics is full of terms that derive from them. Many have a long history and are not univocal; sometimes their use by linguists reflects this only in part; sometimes, as linguists have borrowed them, their senses have slid yet further. But since they do belong to another discipline, a dictionary of linguistics sometimes cannot do more than pick up a fag end. It is perhaps in this area that I feel least happy with the solutions I have at times been driven to.

In the centre of the subject it is, of course, much easier both to lay down principles and to apply them. Since this is a dictionary, it does not include entries that are purely encyclopaedic. Since it is a concise dictionary, my aim has been to explain as many things as possible and as briefly as possible, not, as might be done in another kind of dictionary, to cover less but cover it more expansively. But some things have to be left out. There must, for example, be entries for some individual languages: those that have speakers safely into the millions, those that are important in the history of scholarship, those that, quite simply, the majority of those who will buy this book will feel they should be able to look up. But most languages meet none of these criteria and, however one counts, they are well in the thousands. There should, I believe, be notes on individual scholars, some of them still living. But which? I have tried to limit such entries to people who are cited for their contribution to general linguistics, as opposed to the study of a particular language or family. But if I had relaxed that test the list could have gone on and on. There must also be entries for schools, or for the competing models of syntax, phonology, and so on that tend to define schools. Where these are more than one-man bands they are, I hope, in. But both schools and individual scholars also tend to develop specialized terminology, both new terms and altered senses of old ones. These sometimes pass into general currency and then, of course, they must be included. But where they remain peculiar to a specific model, and are not needed in the entry that explains the model itself, I have had to leave them out. If I had not, the dictionary would again have been much larger.

There must also be limits on what certain classes of entry contain. Under the headings for individual languages, I have said at the least where they are spoken and what family, if any, they are known to belong to. But I have not in general said how many people speak them, and in most cases I do not think this information can be given without reference to surveys at specific dates and the specific evidence and criteria that they used. That is more than a concise dictionary can or should do. I have also refrained from saying anything about their structure: it would, for a start, take more space than can be spared. In the entries for grammatical categories, I have given concrete illustrations where they can be drawn from languages with which a substantial body of readers will be familiar. These naturally tend to be European. Where this cannot be done the illustrations are schematic. I had not at first intended that they should be and, in failing to decorate some entries in this way, I still feel rather as



my wife would if she were forced to go to town without make-up. But decoration is, in reality, all it would be. A monograph or textbook must, of course, supply specific evidence that a category exists. But a dictionary need not and cannot. Its job is simply to make clear how the term is used, and a concrete illustration will at best get in the way if it comes from a language which few readers know and whose general structure is unfamiliar. At worst, there was a danger that I would misunderstand my source or use one that was itself wrong and, without references, no one might know what it was. I would like to feel that, if there are mistakes, they are unequivocally my own.

The rest is mainly a matter of style. In line with other Oxford dictionaries, I have used an asterisk to point to related entries; although its uses in linguistics are for other purposes, I do not think that, in practice, this will cause confusion. Where I refer to scholars for whom there are also entries, I have used their surname without initials, with a first name in brackets where necessary; thus 'Chomsky' or '(Daniel) Jones'. Where an abbreviation is common I have given an entry for it, unless it immediately precedes the term it abbreviates: thus '**ABS** = absolutive'. The abbreviation '*cf.*' means, as usual, 'compare'; I have also used an *ad hoc* abbreviation 'opp.' to indicate a term which is the opposite of the one defined; thus '**bound** ... Opp. free'. Where a term is used in two or more related senses I have distinguished them within an entry; thus '**substratum**. 1. ... 2. ...'. But where senses are effectively unrelated I have separated the entries; thus '**head** (1)' and '**head** (2)'. When a definition begins with words in round brackets, they generally indicate what an adjective or the like is used of; thus '**consecutive**. (Clause, etc.) indicating ...'. In giving examples, I have indicated stress or emphasis, where necessary, by putting a syllable in small capitals; thus '*I need the HAMMER*' (not e.g. the screwdriver). These are often preceded by an accent which gives a rough indication of the intonation; thus '*He's coming*' (with the pitch falling from 'co' onwards), '*He's not coming*' (with the pitch rising), '*Is he coming?*' (fall followed by a rise). Other conventions, e.g. in the use of italics, follow what is now general practice.

Finally, I have included pronunciations (in the IPA transcription used in *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*) only when I thought that readers might be in doubt. For a dictionary of this kind to include them throughout did seem otiose.

## Directory of Symbols    符号表

Symbols and other forms of notation are explained in entries headed by their names: for example, for the uses of '[ ]', see the entry for 'square brackets'. The complete list is as follows.

FOR	SEE	FOR	SEE
'	acute	<i>a, b, ...</i>	italics
< >	angled brackets	$\lambda$	lambda operator
$\rightarrow, \leftarrow$	arrow	$\mu$	mu
*	asterisk	+	plus sign
-	bar, macron	?	question mark
{ }	braces	( )	round brackets
˘	breve	$\sigma$	sigma
^	circumflex	/	slash
-	dash	A, B, ...	small capitals
#	double cross	[ ]	square brackets
!	exclamation mark	>, <	tailless arrow
$\exists$	existential quantifier	~, ~	tilde
`	grave	$\forall$	universal quantifier
$\alpha, \beta, \dots$	Greek letter variables	' , ' ,	vertical line
-	hyphen	$\emptyset$	zero
‘ ’	inverted commas		

# 目 录

出版说明 ..... 1

序(英语原版) ..... 3

符号表(英语原版) ..... 7

**词典正文 ..... 1~505**

附录

汉英术语对照表 ..... 506

# A

**A 1. 形容词** = adjective. **2. 施事者** = agent (2); cf. P. S (3). **3. 主目** = argument, as \*A-bound.

**abbreviated clause** 缩略小句 = reduced clause.

**abbreviation** 缩略语, 缩略式 See acronym; blend; clipping.

**abbreviatory convention** 缩略规约 Any convention which allows a \*generative grammar to be shortened by collapsing two or more rules into one. E. g. a phrase-structure rule  $A' \rightarrow A + \text{Comp}$  (a constituent within an adjective phrase can consist of an adjective plus a complement) can be combined with a rule  $A' \rightarrow A$  into the single expression  $A' \rightarrow A (\text{Comp})$ . By the relevant convention 'A (Comp)' is understood as 'either A or A + Comp'.

The abbreviated expression is technically a \*rule schema.

**abduction** 不明推论 Process of reasoning by which, e. g. from 'All dogs bark' and 'This animal barks', one draws the conclusion 'This animal is a dog'.

Central, in one view, when people develop their native language. E. g. they may learn that if a noun has the ending -s it is plural; so, as one premiss, 'All noun forms in -s are plural'. They may then want to use some noun in the plural. Call the form required *f*; so, as a second premiss, '*f* is plural'. By abduction, the conclusion will be '*f* is a form in -s'; therefore, all else being equal, a form in -s is what they will use. In this process of reasoning the conclusion does not necessarily follow; thus the noun in question might have a plural that does not end in -s. But as the result of it the language may change, with -s generalized to nouns that did not previously have it.

**Abductive change** (不明推论变化) is change due, it is claimed, to abduction. Abduction as a process of reasoning was distinguished by Peirce, who stressed its role in human life in general.

**abessive** 缺席格 \*Case indicating that someone or something is absent; e. g. schematically, *I came money-ABESS*

'I came without money'. From Latin *abesse* 'to be away, be absent'.

**Abkhaz** 阿布哈兹语 North West \*Caucasian language, spoken between the west end of the Caucasus Mountains and the coast of the Black Sea.

**ablative (ABL)** 离格 \*Case whose basic role, or one of whose basic roles, is to indicate movement away from some location: thus Latin *cedit Romā* ('departed Rome-ABLSG') 'He left Rome'.

**ablative absolute** 独立离格 \*Absolute construction in Latin in which a participle and its subject are in the ablative case and are subordinated, with no other mark of linkage, to the rest of the sentence: e.g. in the sentence *urbe capta* '(the) city-ABLSG having-been-taken-ABLSG' *Caesar recessit* 'Caesar withdrew'.

**ablaut** 元音交替 Morphological variation, in Germanic and other \*Indo-European languages, of a root vowel. E.g. in Ancient Greek the root of the verb 'to leave' appeared in three forms: *leip-* in the present; *loip-*, in the perfect or in the adjective *loipós* 'left over'; *lip-*, in the aorist or as the first member of compounds. This illustrates the three original 'grades (级差)' of ablaut: the *e* grade, the *o* grade, and the zero or reduced grade, with neither *e* nor *o*.

Similarly, in English, of vowel variations in \*strong verbs (e.g. *drive, drove, driven*) or between verbs and nouns (*sing, song*), whether or not they derive directly from the Indo-European system.

**A-bound** A-约束的, 受主目约束的 \*Bound (2) by an element in the normal syntactic position of a subject or other \*argument of a verb. E.g. in *I saw myself*, the reflexive *myself* is A-bound by its antecedent *I*.

A term in \*Government and Binding Theory, where it is claimed that some elements, like reflexives, must be A-bound. Other elements need not be; when they are bound by an antecedent not in such a position they are said to be '**A̅-**' or '**A'-bound**' (不受主目约束的).

**abrupt** 突发 \*Distinctive feature in the scheme proposed by \*Jakobson. Characterized acoustically by 'a spread of energy over a wide frequency region': thus, in particular, a feature of oral stops as opposed to fricatives. Also called 'discontinuous' or 'interrupted': opp. continuant.

**ABS** 通格 = absolute.

**absolute** 独立的 (Syntactic element) not accompanied by an element to which one might expect it to be linked. E. g. in *This is bigger*, *bigger* is an **absolute comparative** (独立比较级), not linked, as other comparatives are, to a standard of comparison (*bigger than* ...); in *His is bigger*, *his* is similarly an **absolute possessive** (独立物主代词), not linked, as possessives in general are, to a noun (*his garden*, *his kitchen*, ...). An **absolute case** (独立格), e. g. in Turkish, is so called because it is realized by a root alone, unaccompanied by an affix.

An **absolute construction** (独立结构) is one in which a subordinate element is not linked by a conjunction or in any other specific way to the rest of a sentence. E. g. in *We left, the wine having run out*, the last five words stand in an absolute relation to *we left*; cf. *We left because the wine had run out* (with the conjunction *because*), or *We left, having finished the wine* (with a direct relation between *having* and *we*).

From Latin *absolutus* 'freed from linkage'.

**absolute neutralization** 绝对中和 Term in \*Generative Phonology for the suppression in all contexts of an underlying difference between elements. E. g. in a language with \*vowel harmony, a single open vowel might relate sometimes to front vowels and sometimes to back vowels; a distinction might therefore be established between a front 'a' and a back 'ɑ', which undergoes absolute neutralization after the rules for harmony have applied.

**absolute synonymy** 绝对同义 See synonymy.

'**absolute universal**' 绝对共性 A \*linguistic universal that is genuinely universal; i. e. that holds for all languages, without exception. Opp. relative universal, statistical universal.

**absolute (ABS)** 通格 \*Case which identifies both the \*patient in a basic transitive construction and a single argument or valent in an intransitive. E. g. schematically, *men bread-ABS ate* 'The men ate the bread'; *bread-ABS disappeared* 'The bread disappeared'. The \*agent in the transitive construction will then be \*ergative; *bread-ABS ate men-ERG*. The case is called 'absolute' because, in many languages, it is distinguished by the absence of an affix.

Thence in general of syntactic elements that unite the same

roles, whether or not the language has cases.

**'absorption'** 1. 同化 Used variously of phonological changes or processes in which one element is seen as incorporated in another. Thus **'tonal absorption'** (声调同化) is a process in some languages of West Africa by which the ending of a \*contour tone (rising  $\sim$ , falling  $\wedge$ ) is 'absorbed' by a following syllable whose tone is at the same level: rising  $\sim$  plus high  $\acute{\rightarrow}$  low  $\grave{\text{plus}}$  high  $\acute{\text{;}}$  falling  $\wedge$  plus low  $\grave{\rightarrow}$  high  $\acute{\text{plus}}$  low  $\grave{\text{.}}$  Cf. fusion. 2. 同化 Process in which a case or case role is assigned to one element in a construction and can then no longer be assigned to another.

**abstract** 抽象的 (Structure, representation) which differs from that which is most transparent. E. g. the representation of *righteous* as 'rixt-i- $\text{\textcircled{a}}$ s', proposed at an underlying level in \*Generative Phonology at the end of the 1960s, is more abstract than one which corresponds closely to a phonetic transcription [raɪtʃəs]. Similarly, a representation of the syntax of a sentence is more abstract the more the order in which the words are arranged and the units and categories to which they are assigned differ from their order and potential grouping in speech.

Since the end of the 1960s most linguists have tried to put restrictions on the degree of abstractness that their models will permit; e. g. to exclude representations such as 'rixt-i- $\text{\textcircled{a}}$ s'. But it has been hard to propose firm limits that all will accept; hence in phonology a long-standing **abstractness** (抽象性) controversy.

**'abstract case'** 抽象格 See case.

**abstract noun** 抽象名词 One which denotes an abstract state, property, etc.: e. g. *love*, *happiness*. Opp. concrete.

**ACC** 受格, 宾格 = accusative.

**Accadian** 阿卡得语 = Akkadian.

**accent** (1) 重音 A phonological unit realized by auditory prominence, especially within a word. E. g. in *morning* the first syllable is perceived as more prominent than the second; in phonetic transcription, [ˈmɔːnɪŋ]. This distinguishes it as the **accented** (重读的) syllable, or the one that 'carries the accent'. Originally of \*pitch accents in Ancient Greek; thence of \*stress accents, e. g. in English; thence also applied to peaks of prominence in larger units, such as sentences. E. g. in

*He'll talk to 'ME* ('to me, not someone else'), the 'sentence accent', or \*sentence stress, falls on *me*.

The accents in writing, as in French *père*, *bête*, *céder*, originally distinguished pitches in Greek, the acute a high pitch, the circumflex a falling pitch, the grave a low pitch. But they have since been used for many other purposes, to distinguish length or quality of vowels, different consonants, homonyms, and so on, with others added in the spelling of various languages.

**accent (2)** 口音 A variety of speech differing phonetically from other varieties: thus, as in ordinary usage, 'a Southern accent', 'Scottish accents'. Normally restricted by linguists to cases where the differences are at most in phonology; further differences, e. g. in syntax, are said to be between \*dialects.

**acceptable** 可接受的 (Sentence, etc.) which native speakers will not see as contrary to usage. Often = grammatical (2), but many scholars insist on a distinction, drawn by Chomsky in the 1960s, between the acceptability of a sentence, taken as a datum, and its conformity to the rules of a specific grammar. Thus a sentence like *The man the girl your son knew saw arrived* may be unacceptable to speakers. But its structure conforms to general rules that may be posited for \*relative clauses: *the man* s[*the girl* s[*your son knew*] *saw*].... So, by hypothesis, it is grammatical, and its unacceptability must be explained by other factors, such as the difficulty of keeping track of it in short-term memory.

**accessibility scale** 可及性范围 A scale of elements or categories in order of diminishing applicability of some type or types of process. E. g. in English, a direct object (DO) can generally be made the subject of a passive: *Harry saw them* → *They were seen by Harry*. So can an indirect object (IO), but with more restrictions and exclusions. So too a locative (Loc), but with even more restrictions and exclusions. These elements can thus be said to form a scale: DO > IO > Loc, where x > y means that x is more open to the process.

Similar scales are often formulated across languages: e. g. the \*NP accessibility hierarchy.

**'accident'** 词态 Ancient term for a variable property of words belonging to a specific \*part of speech. Accidents included categories of inflection: e. g. \*number and \*case as variable features of nouns. They also included any other feature that might vary: e. g. the 'quality' of nouns (lit. their



'what-sort-ness') was an accident initially distinguishing \*proper nouns from \*common nouns.

Later used especially of categories of inflection; hence '**accidence** (词态)' is in effect an older term for \*inflectional morphology.

**Accommodation Theory** 调节理论 Branch of \*sociolinguistics concerned with the adjustments made by speakers in adapting or 'accommodating' their speech in response to that of interlocutors who, e. g., are speakers of another dialect.

**accusative (ACC)** 受格, 宾格 \*Case whose basic role, or one of whose basic roles, is to mark a \*direct object. E. g. in Latin *vidi Caesarem* 'I-saw Caesar', the object *Caesarem* has the accusative singular ending *-(e)m*.

The term derives from a mistranslation into Latin of a Greek term that was already obscure. There is and was no connection with accusing.

**accusative and infinitive** 受格与不定式 Construction in Latin in which an indirect statement was marked by a verb in the infinitive whose subject was in the accusative; e. g. in *Dixit Caesarem venisse* 'he-said Caesar-ACCSG had-come-INF' ('He said that Caesar had come'). Extended to formally similar constructions in other languages; e. g. in English (*He told*) *me to come*.

**'accusative language'** 受格语言 One which has a \*nominative and an \*accusative case, or which distinguishes subjects and objects in an equivalent way. E. g. English; thus, in *The boy saw her* and *The boy smiled*, the role of *the boy* as subject is distinguished by its position from its role as object in *She saw the boy*.

Coined in opposition to 'ergative language'; see also active language.

**Achinese** 亚奇语 \*Austronesian language spoken at the northern end of Sumatra. Also '**Achehnese** (亚奇语)'.

**'acoustic image'** 音响形象 See linguistic sign.

**acoustic phonetics** 声学语音学 The study of the physical properties of the sounds produced in speech. Opp. articulatory phonetics.

**'acquired'** 后天的 (Speech disorder) resulting from disease or injury to the brain, in someone who did not show it before. Thus \*aphasia is by definition 'acquired'; \*dyslexia,