

青年学者文库

德语指示词研究

基于哥伦比亚学派框架的再思考

The German Demonstratives

A Study in the Columbia School
Linguistics Framework

林琳 著



北京大学出版社
PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS

青年学者文库

德语指示词研究

基于哥伦比亚学派框架的再思考

The German Demonstratives

A Study in the Columbia School
Linguistics Framework

林琳 著



北京大学出版社
PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

德语指示词研究:基于哥伦比亚学派框架的再思考/林琳著. —北京:北京大学出版社,2018.3

(青年学者文库)

ISBN 978-7-301-29283-9

I. ①德… II. ①林… III. ①德语—词语—研究 IV. ①H333

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2018)第 034868 号

书 名 德语指示词研究——基于哥伦比亚学派框架的再思考
DEYU ZHISHICI YANJIU——JIYU GELUNBIYA
XUEPAI KUANGJIA DE ZAI SIKAO

著作责任者 林琳 著

责任编辑 朱房煦

标准书号 ISBN 978-7-301-29283-9

出版发行 北京大学出版社

地 址 北京市海淀区成府路 205 号 100871

网 址 <http://www.pup.cn> 新浪微博 @北京大学出版社

电子信箱 zhufangxu@yeah.net

电 话 邮购部 62752015 发行部 62750672 编辑部 62754382

印 刷 者 北京京华虎彩印刷有限公司

经 销 者 新华书店

650 毫米×980 毫米 16 开本 19 印张 310 千字

2018 年 3 月第 1 版 2018 年 3 月第 1 次印刷

定 价 56.00 元



未经许可,不得以任何方式复制或抄袭本书之部分或全部内容。

版权所有,侵权必究

举报电话:010-62752024 电子信箱:fd@pup.pku.edu.cn

图书如有印装质量问题,请与出版部联系,电话:010-62756370

作者简介

林琳，北京大学外国语学院德语系讲师。2007年毕业于北京大学，获文学学士和经济学学士学位；2013年毕业于美国加州大学洛杉矶分校 (UCLA)，获日耳曼语言学博士学位。2015年获外国语学院教学优秀奖，出版著作 *A Semantic Study of German and Chinese Demonstratives* (2013)，译作《德语语法活学活用》(2017) 等。

内容简介

德语作为一门屈折语和中文这种孤立语有着非常大的区别，在指示代词的使用方面也不例外。这些区别对以中文为母语的德语二语习得者的学习有怎样的影响、究竟应该如何正确使用德语的近指和远指，都是要解决的核心问题。在本书中，这些词的用法会被放在语篇及文本中进行讨论；同时，对近指和远指概念的定义也不局限在空间远近上，还包括时间远近及情感亲疏。



Kami Yama Kikou

2017年度获上山出版基金资助图书

需求结构对产业结构演进的影响研究

知识与境界

——知识在唐君毅心灵九境论中的作用与定位

中日同形词双重误用研究

德语指示词研究

——基于哥伦比亚学派框架的再思考

朴婉绪小说汉译研究

封面设计: 奇文雲海 Chival IDEA

试读结束: 需要全本请在线购买: www.ertongbook.com



本书获得北京大学上山出版基金资助，特此致谢！



To my mom Haiqin Wang (1960—2017)

Abbreviations

The abbreviations follow Li and Thompson (1981, p. xxiii) and Wu (2004), with slight adaptations.

| ABBREVIATION | TERM |
|--------------|--|
| ADP | adverbial particle (function word) |
| [ACC] | accusative |
| ART | article |
| BA | preposed object marker (<i>ba</i>) |
| CL | classifier |
| COMP | comparative |
| CRS | currently relevant state (<i>le</i>) |
| CSC | complex stative construction (<i>de</i>) |
| [DAT] | dative |
| DC | directional complement |
| DM | demonstrative |
| DUR | durative aspect marker (<i>zhe, zai</i>) |
| EXP | experiential aspect marker (<i>guo</i>) |
| EXT | existential (<i>you</i>) |
| [FEM] | feminine noun |
| fut | future tense |
| GEN | genitive (<i>de</i>) |
| IJ | interjection |
| inf | verb infinitive |
| [MASC] | masculine noun |

| | |
|--------|--|
| MM | modifier marker (<i>de</i>) |
| [NEUT] | neuter noun |
| NOM | nominalizer (<i>de</i>) |
| [NOM] | nominative |
| NP | noun phrase |
| PC | potential complement |
| PFV | perfective aspect (<i>-le</i>) |
| pl | verb plural |
| PL | plural (<i>-men, -xie</i>) |
| PM | plural marker |
| POS | modal verb indicating possibility (<i>hui</i>) |
| pp | past participle |
| pres | present tense |
| sg | verb singular |
| SG | singular |
| subj | subjunctive |
| QN | quantifier |
| QS | question marker |
| RC | resultative complement |
| RF | reduce forcefulness (<i>a/ya</i>) |
| VC | verb complement |
| 1sg | first person singular |
| 2sg | second person singular |
| 3sg | third person singular |
| 1pl | first person plural |
| 2pl | second person plural |
| 3pl | third person plural |

Preface

This volume explores, analyzes, and compares the usage of German and Chinese demonstratives. Discourse and textual uses of the forms will be considered as well as their locative and temporal uses. I observe that in both languages the demonstratives can be used to refer to referents. However, they depart from the common sense that proximal demonstratives refer to entities or places close to the speaker and non-proximal demonstratives to entities or places far from the speaker. With the result of analyzing a language sample consisting of a German text and a Chinese text, I argue that both German and Chinese proximal demonstratives can signal the meaning of HIGH DEIXIS in a semantic system of DEIXIS in the Columbia School of Linguistics framework, whereas their non-proximal demonstratives the meaning of LOW DEIXIS. In addition, the Chinese demonstratives can be used under more circumstances than the German demonstratives due to the lack of articles in Chinese. I also argue that Cognitive Linguistics analysis will better help a language learner, whereas Columbia School Linguistics may be of greater assistance if the learner has advanced to a level where he/she needs to know more about the most intrinsic differences between words with similar meanings and usages.

Chapter 1 postulates the problems that exist in the German and Chinese demonstrative systems (despite their radical typological

differences), and contains earlier works of linguists who extended the study to many other Indo-European languages (as for Latin, see Diver, 2012; for French, Reid, 1977; for Dutch, Kirsner 1979; etc.). In terms of theory, they reflect what is known as Columbia School linguistics, which was founded by William Diver at Columbia University in the 1960s (see Diver, 1969) and then flourished by his graduate students in the second half of the 20th century. Among them was my *Doktorvater* ‘Ph.D. advisor’ Professor Robert S. Kirsner. His study of phenomena in the grammar and lexicon of Dutch and his sister language Afrikaans lacks the presence of Generative Grammar (see Chomsky, 1957, 1965) and presents deficiencies of this generative analysis on the Dutch article system and Dutch “flavoring particles” (Kirsner, 2014, p. 1).

In Chapter 2 I discuss the nature of demonstratives. This is not limited to German nor Chinese. Demonstratives, similar to articles, pick out referents from other similar or identical entities and, in addition to that, provide information on how distant the referent is located from the speaker. Proximal demonstratives generally refer to entities close to the speaker, while distal demonstratives to ones far from the speaker. It is worth noting that proximal and distal demonstratives may refer to entities at the same place. If so, other factors should be taken into consideration, such as psychological distance (i. e. whether the entity is favored by the speaker).

Columbia School analyses take place in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4. German as an inflecting language with an article system, bears the notion that there are three interlocking systems of semantic oppositions

that determine an entity's differentiation; the system of NUMBER, the system of DIFFERENTIATION, and the system of DEIXIS. In the system of NUMBER, whether a noun is singular (signaling ONE) is taken into account; in the system of DIFFERENTIATION, whether the noun is preceded by a definite article, an indefinite article or not preceded; and in the system of DEIXIS, whether there is a proximal or a distal demonstrative is present. In contrast, Chinese does not change word forms according to their different grammar roles (i. e. is isolating) and nor does it have articles. In this case, only the system of DEIXIS plays a role. Note that whether the noun is generic, definite or indefinite is not part of the study. Particularly, in a system of DEIXIS, as the referent is already definite, demonstratives do not describe where the referent is but rather urge the hearer to "seek out and attend to the referent" (Kirsner, 2014, p.1). Also, it should be kept in mind that it is the article not the demonstrative that makes a referent (in)definite and stand out from other entities.

Chapter 5 consists a comparative study of demonstratives in both languages with the assistance of parallel texts. It also contains a summary and conclusions drawn from the studies in this volume. It is shown that German and Chinese demonstratives, though differing from each other morphologically and syntactically, still share many similarities linguistically and extra-linguistically.

Columbia School analysis is a top-down approach and provides relatively sparse meaning to the forms in question with qualitative and quantitative evidence. Cognitive Grammar performs bottom-up researches and shows how messages are processed in reality. It is

beneficial to apply both approaches to the same question and gain a more insightful starting point and a full-fledged conclusion. On one hand, Columbia School analysis does not provide explicit meaning for language forms, while Cognitive Grammar is more specific and clear with how messages are processed and under which conditions one form can be utilized; on the other hand, Cognitive Grammar is not able to help advanced language learners with understanding the more intrinsic differences between words or usages (e. g. synonyms etc.), it is then better to turn to Columbia School analysis, which provides a form with its sparse meaning from a native speaker's perspective (Diver, 1969, 1995; Garcia, 1975; Langacker, 1987; Smith, 1987).

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 001 |
| 1.1 Introductory Remarks | 001 |
| 1.2 The Problem | 003 |
| 1.3 Literature Review | 008 |
| 1.4 Research Methodology | 027 |
| | |
| Chapter 2 Demonstratives | 033 |
| 2.1 The Nature of Demonstratives | 033 |
| 2.2 The Scope of the Study | 043 |
| 2.3 Typological Features of the Chinese and German Languages | 046 |
| | |
| Chapter 3 The German Demonstratives | 093 |
| 3.1 The System of NUMBER | 097 |
| 3.2 The System of DIFFERENTIATION | 115 |
| 3.3 The System of DEIXIS | 142 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chapter 4 The Chinese Demonstratives | 167 |
| 4.1 A Language Without an Article System | 167 |
| 4.2 The Problem | 174 |
| 4.3 The Hypothesis | 177 |
| 4.4 Qualitative Validation | 178 |
| 4.5 Quantitative Validation | 205 |
| 4.6 Alternative Studies | 215 |
| 4.7 Conclusion | 222 |
| | |
| Chapter 5 German and Chinese Demonstratives in Discourse | 223 |
| 5.1 The Data | 224 |
| 5.2 Overview | 228 |
| 5.3 Similarities in the Use of German and Chinese Demonstratives | 231 |
| 5.4 Differences Between the Use of the German and Chinese Demonstratives | 248 |
| 5.5 Conclusion | 271 |
| 5.6 Discussion | 272 |
| | |
| References | 275 |
| | |
| Acknowledgements | 289 |

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introductory Remarks

This study will explore, analyze, and compare the usage of German and Chinese demonstratives. Discourse and textual uses of the forms will be considered as well as their locative and temporal uses. In both languages, the demonstratives form a closed system and may therefore be considered “grammar” rather than lexicon (Diver, 1995). But do the individual demonstratives in Chinese have the same uses as the German demonstratives? If so, can one say that there is a one-to-one match between the members of the two systems and, at a more abstract level, that the corresponding members signal similar meanings within their own systems? Or are there differences in the number and kind of uses in the two languages? If there *are* differences, are these best attributed to a difference in semantics (a difference in meaning) or a difference in what the Columbia Schools would call strategies of exploitation (i. e. the speaker forms the speech differently according to the aim of the communication, the hearer’s background information, and/or the environment of the communication etc.) (Garcia, 1975)? Moreover, if there are differences, how much may this be considered the domain of pragmatics, in addition to the vast differences between the cultures of Chinese speakers and German speakers?

One difference, for example, in the use of demonstratives between the two languages is worth noting. With respect to German, where demonstratives could be analyzed in traditional locative terms, with *dieser* signaling proximate and *jener* signaling distal, we must note that pedagogical and even reference grammars almost totally omit *jener*, since it is rare in the modern spoken language. The deictic use of articles, i. e. *der*, *die* and *das*, is the replacement for *jener*, while a combination of articles and locational adverbs, i. e. *dort*, *da* etc., is used to refer to distance in time and space. The Chinese demonstratives *zhe* ‘this’ and *na* ‘that,’ in turn, have been analyzed only in terms of the relative proximity of the referent. In both cases, the non-locative uses of the demonstratives have been more or less ignored. One purpose of this book is to discover precisely what these discourse uses are, and how similar and how different they are.

The theoretical and methodological approach to be used in this book is that of the Columbia School. Although less well-known than other approaches (such as, in formal linguistics, generative grammar; and in discourse-functional linguistics, cognitive grammar), the Columbia School has the advantages of first, having devoted considerable attention to the discourse functions of demonstratives, pronouns, verb tense systems and negation; and second, of having proposed interesting and radically non-traditional semantic analyses of these elements. It also has been shown that Columbia School analyses may be “translated” into Cognitive Grammar analyses by considering what the Columbia School has viewed as “strategies of exploitation” to be independent and conventionalized uses of a polysemous item (Kirsner, 1993; Langacker, 1987, 1995).

This study attempts to show that there are many similarities in the