

外国语言文学论丛()

主 编 石发林 陈 才

副主编 代光伦 常代兵 左 莉

张贯之 刘 琴 聂 翔

编 委 李士俊 黄开红 范 波

尹松涛 黄雪飞 邹永红

曾见永 李小龙 李敏静

王 静

电子科技大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

外国语言文学论丛() / 石发林, 陈才主编. —成都: 电子科技大学出版社, 2004.12

ISBN 7-81094-736-2

. 外 石 陈 语言学 - 外国
- 文集 文学研究 - 外国 - 文集 IV. H0-53 I106-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2004)第 140530 号

内 容 提 要

该书汇集了辛勤耕耘在外语教学第一线的广大教师和教育工作者的教学及科研成果。内容涉及语言学、文学、文化、翻译、教学法、电化教学等领域。本书可供大专院校师生及中小学教师学习、参考。

外国语言文学论丛()

石发林 陈 才 主编

出 版 电子科技大学出版社(成都市建设北路二段四号, 邮编: 610054)
责任编辑 曾 艺
发 行 电子科技大学出版社
印 刷 电子科技大学出版社印刷厂
开 本 787×1092 1/16 印张 24.875 字数 600 千字
版 次 2004 年 12 月第一版
印 次 2004 年 12 月第一次印刷
书 号 ISBN 7-81094-736-2/H·26
定 价 29.00 元

前 言

经过一年多的努力，《外国语言文学论丛()》终于与广大读者见面了。该书汇集了辛勤耕耘在外语教学第一线的广大教师和教育工作者的教学及科研成果。内容涉及语言学、文学、文化、翻译、教学法、电化教学等领域。本书可供大专院校师生及中小学教师学习、参考。本书能成功出版，得益于全国外语界专家学者的大力支持。在此，谨向他们致以衷心的感谢。

由于时间仓促，编者水平有限，书中难免有不足之处，敬请学界前辈、同仁批评斧正。

编 者
2004年11月

目 录

一、语 言 学

略论话语重复对流利的语用制约性	葛维德 (1)
Comparing Structural Grammar and TG Grammar.....	Zhang Guan zhi (7)
从 RP 看英国英语“标准发音”的内涵.....	郭启平 (12)
Contrastive Study on Compliment Responses Between American Speakers and Chinese Speakers.....	熊婷婷 (15)
目的性阅读与词汇习得	刘 琴 (21)
The Indirectness of Language	刘 柳 (26)
布龙菲尔德语言观探讨	胡永红 (33)
A General Survey of Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis	吴志萌 (36)

二、文学评论

Splendid Twins of Early Feminism	Nie Xiang (42)
评 A·D·霍普诗两首	石发林 (48)
Decoding Shenandoah in Mourning Becomes Electra	郑 力 (53)
Puritanism & Early American Literature.....	Du Ping (57)
汉字和英语象形诗的诗意对比	孙 化 (60)
她眼中的死亡	蔡秀娟 (66)
简评《宠儿》的人性、人性二元冲突与文体	邓曼娜 (71)
ON O'NEILL'S WOMEN WHOSE HORIZONS WERE LIMITED.....	Nie Xiang (77)
安徒生童话的艺术特色	夏 露 (82)
理想与现实冲突的殉葬品	黄开红 (86)
On Fowles' Writing Techniques in The French Lieutenant's Woman.....	李敏静 (92)
心理冲突在《哈姆雷特》中的展现	刘 容 (98)

三、翻译理论与实践)

Translation and Clause Structures	陈玉堂 (105)
从《中国译学理论史稿》看中国翻译理论体系	任运忠 (111)
再谈文学翻译的再创造	石发林 (115)

Is Poetry What GetS Lost in Translation ?	杨林伟 (120)
浅谈中西翻译之异同	曾 真 (126)
浅谈翻译理论与实践的辩证关系	胡春莲 (130)
浅谈国际商标文化与翻译	潘 娜 (135)
浅谈商贸汉英翻译原则	罗红莲 (139)
名词的转译法	邓曼娜 (143)
浅谈翻译中词义的理解和选择	冯 萍 (147)
浅谈文学翻译中的语义引申	周 文 (153)
英汉“被动句”的比较与翻译	袁 曦 (159)
小议英语典故性成语来源与汉译	谢晓萍 (164)
文学作品意译探源	蒋 烨 (167)
英汉成语的对比翻译	文小兵 (173)
浅谈文化语境与翻译	李 媛 (178)

四、外语教学与研究

外语学习过程中的主要因素对大学英语教学质量影响的调查分析	李凤华 (182)
Krashen's Input hypothesis and FLT in China	周 蓉 (188)
中日言語の発想・表現の比較	王美森 (195)
CET 口语测试与口语教学	鄧 红 姜 红 (201)
从英汉对比角度谈英语写作	颜太容 (206)
Krashen's Theory and English Teaching in China	李云涛 (211)
多媒体网络技术与中学英语教学改革	黄维楷 张学明 (215)
论英语词汇特性和词汇教学	李迎春 (219)
论外语课堂交际中教师反馈语对课堂学习焦虑的影响	黄 瑛 阳 艳 (225)
大学外语教学中的文化导入问题及处理方法	甘成英 (230)
谈学习策略和情感态度在中学英语学习中的作用	高 文 (234)
更新学习观念 提高学习成效	何维克 (237)
浅析英汉对译中的“语言包”问题及其教学对策	张 帆 (241)
Why Do We Use Dictation In English Teaching ?	Jia Min (246)
英语教师目前面临的问题及解决办法	梁艳春 姜 红 (251)
如何在高校英语专业教学中提高学生的“交际能力”	尹松涛 黄雪飞 (255)
试析文化因素对大学生英语听力的影响及应对策略	甘成英 (259)
中学英语语法教学的探索	罗培容 (262)
英语教学与英语方言	李小龙 (265)
如何有效提高大学英语课堂教学质量	王玉兰 (270)
整体语言教学法的评价及其在我国英语教学中的实施	刘 兴 (274)
谈多媒体环境下的英语视听说教学方法	吴天骄 (278)
On English Vocabulary-Teaching in Junior Middle School.....	杨小兰 (282)

Interest Is The Best Teacher	杨淑慧 (288)
授業改善の方法について	张景一 (291)

五、其 他

英语中女性的物化现象	胡晓华 顾晓利 (294)
Cultural Influences on Context : The Business Setting	Chen Cai (301)
少数民族地区阅读测试的真实性刍议	王晓军 (305)
私の知っている日本人	邓 力 (311)
英语篇章中 Anadiplosis 与汉语篇章中顶真比较	李仕俊 (316)
法律英语的语汇特征	杨绍江 (322)
英语报刊语言再论	王 静 (328)
中国网络语词汇初探	范 波 (332)
英汉定语用法比较及其互译中应注意的问题	刘 兴 (337)
科技英语的语言特点和语篇特点	陈 敏 (341)
试析历史上关于汉字优劣的争论及汉字的发展前景	蒋丽君 (349)
论英汉语言中的性别歧视现象	周晓蓉 贾 敏 (353)
利用 IT 技术构建英语自主学习中心	陈 才 王 静 (357)
数字语言实验室的发展动态	谢 春 (361)
经济英语的特点刍议	杨绍江 (364)
印象に残った学校	左 莉 (370)
日语动词的分类	左 莉 (373)
The origins of Misunderstanding in Conversation	Wei Quanfeng Wang Yingfeng (377)
大学英语听力的正交实验研究	付玉群 (385)

一、语言学

略论话语重复对流利的语用制约性

葛维德

(南京理工大学人文学院英语系 江苏南京 210094)

摘要：为适应英语专业或非英语专业口语与口译测试工作迅速推开的趋势，在阐释话语重复制约流利程度的理论基础上，本文从心理语言学、社会语言学及学习策略的角度，列举并分析了流利独白者的流利特征，欠流利独白者的症结所在，分别讨论了话语重复对口语流利者、欠流利者以及会话双方的不同语用制约性，以期构建更健全、更理性、更富于创新的口语评估体系。

关键词：流利；话语重复；口语测试；语用制约性

一、引言

随着高校英语测试改革的不断深入，英语专业的四、六级与非英语专业的四、六级的口语考试已经或正逐步在全国范围推开。为此，如何在口语流利程度的测评中探索制约流利的重要因素，消除阻碍流利的不利因素，培养增进流利的有利因素，如何在口语测试中充分体现系统性、创新性和科学性的原则，理应成为语言测试研究中不容忽视的重要课题之一。

从心理语言学的角度分析说话人的话语生成，不难看出，除了具备某些明显的、可量化的话语特征（如语速、语量、语流、话语的持续性、单位时间表述的长度、流利语言单元的长度等）之外，口语流利还应符合某些重要的、涉及语用功能的定性标准。桂诗春先生在综述一些心理语言学家的观点后指出：“在连续性言语听辨中，人们处在一个主动的心理过程，他们依靠句子中各种语言制约来合成单词，然后分析这些单词和自己所听到的是否一致。各种语言制约可以帮助人们缩小他们所合成的词语的范围，而且推测出一些听不清楚的词语。”那么，哪些语言制约因素能有助于教师准确界定说话人的流利程度，辅佐说话人巧妙构思话语并灵活表述呢？英语口语教学及测试表明：话语重复是串联和配套各话语单元的重要模式，也是制约和衡量口语流利的一个重要定性因素。

二、话语重复制约流利的理论依据

通常情况下，说话人在口语实践或测试中较多的话语重复容易给评估人啰嗦、累赘的表面印象，但如具体分析，不难发现：欠流利说话人由于缺乏表述的动力，或是不具备把

握话语重复的能力，习惯用一些逻辑混乱、缺乏意义的断言片语去充填表述中的话语空白；与之相反，口语流利者则怀有较强的表述欲望，善于用恰当的惯用法或套语填补话语构思及表述中的时间空白。正是这两类话语重复在功能及内容上的差异，导致了流利程度与表述质量上的悬殊。

Tannen 指出：“话语重复使说话人能以更有效、少费力的方式去构思语言，利于用更流利的方式生成更多的话语。对习惯赘述或希望随意交谈中避免冷场的个人或文化群体而言，话语重复可视为提供谈话素材，使表述自动流畅的一种语言资源。”不同于手忙脚乱，用缺乏逻辑和无意义的赘语拖延交谈进程的欠流利者的是，口语流利者不仅利用话语重复这一“资源”去构思更恰当的表述内容，还用它不断修改或更新先前表述中的不当或错误话语，致力于话语生动、结构规范、语义准确这一理想目标。

Sperber 和 Wilson 也认为：信息处理中，说话人应致力于两个目的：（1）最大限度地减少听话人理解话语时所付出的努力；（2）最大程度地增加话语的语境效果。显然，要实现这两点，除了说话人的语境选择之外，话语重复内容的选择同样关键。尽管话语重复不可避免地受到诸多心理和社会环境因素的制约，重复内容的选择仍应始终遵循两个原则：最大限度地便利听话人的理解；在增强话语语境效果的同时，最大程度地发挥正向语用制约性，削弱逆向语用制约性。事实上，任何话语重复只有一个目的：即说话人能借助重复去充实、更新话语，逐步深化表述要点，而听话人只付出最少的努力就能理解对方话语。这一现象应视为对流利的正向语用制约性。但如果说话人缺乏选择恰当重复内容的能力，或是缺乏主动表述的积极性，而用支离破碎、词不达意的只言片语填补话语中的表述空白，从而使听话人陷入困惑、茫然的尴尬境地，则应视为对流利的逆向语用制约性。

三、话语重复对流利的语用制约功能

从语用功能看，话语重复不仅体现话段衔接功能和语义蕴涵，还应视作话语信息内容的一部分，从局部或总体上对说话人的表述及听话人的话语构建与理解产生语用制约性，具有动态的语用特征。

1. 话语重复模式对流利者的正向语用制约性

对口语流利者来说，话语重复既可对其感觉到的流利起着积极的心理促进作用，从而提高流利等级，也可对其在语言运用中的流利程度起着正向的语用制约功能，进而推进说话人在会话中流利状态的延续。实质上，说话人在话语生成过程中的话语重复就是为了对听话人的理解形成某种制约，即确保听话人在付出尽可能少的努力的前提下把握话语与认知语境之间的关联。因此，话语越明确，听话人受到的正向制约就越大。例如，下面无提示的独白中，流利程度较高的学生 A 围绕“电视的正面效应”这一论题，运用话语重复逐步递进和深化了自己的论点：

Well, what do I think of television? Um, ...it keeps the family at home, keeps the family together, and uh, keeps the family harmonious, And, um, television in itself is very good; much, er, much of the information, and a lot of the programs are very interesting,

er, enlightening, or instructive, they introduce us to something new, or novel we may...um, might never have thought of, or heard about before. So, ...in this sense, they are beneficial to us by...um, widening our horizon, and broadening the mind... .

显然, 口语流利的学生 A 运用话语重复的效果体现在两个层面: (1) 词义和语义在词汇的推敲中更加明确。(2) 语境效果在新词的润饰中得到增强。第一层面中, 学生 A 重复 keep the family 三次, 分别增添 at home, together 和 harmonious 作为对 family 的补足成分, 不仅避免了词汇的单调重复, 还赋予 keep 引导的三个并列补足成分更贴切、更新颖的语义。类似的重复还有 interesting, enlightening, instructive 及 new, novel。从表面上看, 上述三组话语重复延缓了语速, 实际上使说话人赢得时间去从容构思和表述自己的思想, 确保语义得到明晰的体现, 推进流利状态顺畅延续, 同时还使听话人以最少的努力从对话语的一般性理解过渡到深层次的赏析, 实现对话语流利的正向语用制约; 第二层面中, 说话人不满足于宽泛地描述电视给人们带来的纯娱乐享受, 而是积极思考, 灵活运用认知理论中的相关性原则, 从“we may...um, might never have thought of, or heard about before”这一概述中妙用联想技巧, 构想出“widening our horizon”和“broadening the mind”一类言简意赅的套语式表述。说话人睿智的构思与精妙的遣词由此可见一斑。

2. 话语重复模式对欠流利者的逆向语用制约性

不难在给定同一论题的前提下, 流利者与欠佳者在运用话语重复中显示出的能力差异是显而易见的, 以下学生 B 的独白就验证了这一点:

I ... I have a television in fact, oh, no, I ... I have two as I said. We know, er, we think, um, um, watch TV is, ... is a good thing because it help you much, er, a lot, and ... and give you happy, er, ... yes, it make you pleasure, But, er, I ... I think there's a question, a problem Um, ... there are happening, or, no, happened bad ... bad things, For example, um, um, I cost much time, er ... no, I spend much time to ... to watch TV every day. So ... I not ... don't want to ... to do anything now.

由此看出, 学生 B 虽竭力想利用话语重复完善自己的表述, 但他的话语重复基本上按照开始——退回——再开始这种既无规范结构, 又无正确语义的模式机械地循环。由于学生 B 的独白起步唐突, 话语充满语误, 加之这类错误的重复大体徘徊在同一语义层面上, 因而给人言语啰嗦、语义混沌、逻辑混乱的感觉。假如说学生 B 独白中的“there's a question, a problem”的表述属尚可接受的重复话段, 那么, 随后的“there are happening”, “there are happened”, “I cost much time ...”以及“I spend much time to watch”等错误结构频现的话语重复, 便充分暴露该学生脆弱的语言基础和不良的用语习惯。从表面看, 说话人充满语病的重复阻碍了语义的表达, 延缓了表述的进程, 实质上, 由于说话人未能提供与听话人的认知语境相关联的信息, 即未能调动有效的手段帮助对方去理解与推断自己的交际意图, 尽管听话人付出了较大努力, 但由于说话人烘托的话语语境效果较差, 听众很难确切理解说话人的表述意图。换句话说, 欠流利者的话语重复对自我表述和听众的话语理解起了逆向语用制约作用。

3. 话语重复在会话中的双向语用制约性

实现交谈目标的进程中，会话双方相互影响的流利程度能促使说话人意识到有必要运用交谈策略，最大可能地产生流利的表述。事实上，由于话语重复的运用，澄清语义，推进交谈的某些责任可能会从会话的一方转移到另一方。会话中，对流利者而言，仅仅实现自我流畅表述远远不够，另一不容回避的责任在于如何调动各种手段激励欠流利者主动表述，从而既圆满地实现交谈目标，又能保全双方的面子。以下学生 C 与教师的交谈就较典型地体现了话语重复的双向语用制约功能：

学生 C：Examinations give us no...no good, I...I think, er, ...examinations, um, um ...

教师：Do you mean to say examinations do more harm than good?

学生 C：Oh, yes, ...they do us more harm than good. Um ...er, ... we spend so much time preparing for examinations, ...er, ...

教师：...that we have no enough time for personal preference, or, say, for other courses, and ...

学生 C：Yes, ...yes, ...and we have no enough time to enjoy ourselves, no enough time to do some, ...some reading.

教师：That's true. Then, how can we deal with examinations in a proper way?

学生 C：Um ..., well, I, ... I think, anyway... we should have something necessary ...

教师：That's right. We should have some necessary examinations and reject those unnecessary ones. Do you agree?

学生 C：Yeah, I... I agree.

分析显示：尽管学生 C 与学生 B 的口语能力大体相当，但会话中的学生 C 比独白的学生 B 有着较高的流利程度。一个重要原因在于：作为流利者的教师在会话中成功运用了三组话语重复，适时激活该学生表述的内在动力，巧妙启发学生的话语构思及话段衔接，逐步推进交谈的深入。其一，当学生 C 无法表达考试究竟是利大还是弊大时，教师选择了激励性话语重复“Do you mean to say examinations do more harm than good?”，意在鼓励该学生重新启动自己的表述；其二，当学生 C 发现难以表述为准备考试花费过多时间而造成的负面效应时，教师采取了纠误性与诱导性提示相结合的话语重复“... that we have no enough time for personal preference, ...”。这里的“that”属纠误性提示，暗示学生 C 运用“spend so much time”之后的疏漏，而“We have no enough time for personal preference, ...”则诱导学生自己进一步列举具体的负面效应；其三，在学生 C 感到某些考试还是必要，但无法深入表达时，教师则运用拓展性话语重复，将学生的“something necessary”细化为“have some necessary examinations and reject those unnecessary ones”。显然，得益于流利一方在会话中的各类提示性话语重复，欠流利会话者能逐步顺畅地进行表述，有效地维护了面子；当然，流利一方也借助欠流利者的话语重复策略地进行沟通，维护了流利者应有的风度。由此可见，有效的话语重复对交际双方的双向语用制约功能效性。

四、结语具有不可低估的实效性和潜力

Long and Crookes 指出：“言语重复对于语言测试、语言教学和研究具有丰富的启示，对教学而言，此项研究的一个显著启示佐证了这样一种见解：给人以深刻印象的教学应包括将各类演讲任务与课堂实践结合起来。”

众所周知，英语演讲任务通常涉及独白、会话、小组讨论或辩论会等诸多场合，此外，口语、口译测试也给演说人提供了展示他们口语能力的舞台，这就从另一侧面证明口语或口译的测评工作极具潜力和研究空间，也预示了流利程度评估的复杂性和多变性。笔者认为：无论是独白还是会话，都不应忽略以下与话语重复相关的流利特征：

1. 表述人的话语重复可能使语速放慢，却能使语义明晰，表述畅达。语速与语义的结合孕育流利内涵的升华。

2. 表述人的话语重复切忌在同一语义层面上单调重复，应通过词义推敲和完善令语义呈现多层次的逐步递进。

3. 会话中，流利者可通过善意纠误和诱导性重复，消除欠流利者表述时的心理障碍，维护其面子，增强其信心，为自我表述“提速”。

4. 会话中，流利者可借助话语重复适当减缓自己的语速，缩小与欠流利者在语速上的差距，从而提高交谈的总体质量。

5. 除话语重复外，流利者还应注重影响流利的深层次的因素，运用提问技巧（questioning technique），应答技巧（answering technique），请求技巧（requesting technique），犹豫技巧（hesitation technique）等综合性口语策略，并重视借助套语表述等方面的能力。

坦率地讲，话语重复之所以未被经常列为流利评估标准的一个重要原因在于它涉及到心理语言学、社会语言学和学习策略能力等众多研究范畴，标准的把握有一定灵活性。尽管如此，笔者期望作为流利特征之一的话语重复的探讨能引起更多圈内人士的关注，从而尽快完善我国高校现有口语及口译测试与评估体系。

参 考 文 献

1. 桂诗春. 应用语言学 [M]. 长沙: 湖南教育出版社, 1987
2. 何自然, 冉永平主编. 话语联系语的语用制约性 [A]. 何自然, 冉永平主编. 语用与认知 [C]. 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 2001
3. Stern, H.H. Issues and Options in Language Teaching [M]. 上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 1999
4. Tannen, D. Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse [M]. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989
5. 吴祯幅, 夏玉和, 金利民. 英语高级口语 [M]. 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 1998

6 . Ejzenberg , Roseli . The Juggling Act of Oral Fluency : A Psycho-Socio linguistic Metaphor[A] . In Heidi Riggen bach. (ed.) Perspectives On Fluency[C] . Michigan : The University of Michigan Press , 2000

7 . Jones , Leo . Functions of English[M] . Cambridge : Cambridge University Press , 1981

Abstract : To adapt to the rapid popularization of Oral English Test and Interpretation Evaluation for both English and non-English major students nationwide , based on a brief theoretical analysis of the effects of repetition on fluency , this paper attempts , from various perspectives of psycholinguistics , sociolinguistics and learning strategies , to illustrate some typical features of fluent speakers as well as the drawbacks of the nonfluent , and focuses on the pragmatic constraints of repetition on fluent and nonfluent speakers as well as interlocutors in a monologue or a conversation , in the hope of enhancing the establishment of a more sound , more rational and more innovative fluency-rating system.

Key words : fluency ; repetition ; oral test ; pragmatic constraints

Comparing Structural Grammar and TG Grammar

Zhang Guan zhi

(School of Foreign Languages & Cultures , Southwest University of Science & Technology 621010)

Abstract : English grammar deals with the study of how English is used for the communication of ideas . The heritage of grammar studies is outlined for further reference and deep considerations . The paper builds on what learners already know to develop an appreciation for how the language works . The author hopes to help language learners to be aware of the long-established tradition and the insights of several contemporary schools of linguistics , which have contributed very great stimulus to grammar studies.

Key Words : English grammar ; structural grammar ; TG grammar

English is so enormously complex , flexible and creative that there are many ways to approach a description of how it works . Of these approaches , there are customarily four major schools of grammar : traditional grammar , structural grammar , transformational-generative (shortened as TG) grammar and functional grammar . Today in speaking of a traditional grammar , one would immediately think of its prescriptivism (the task of a grammarian to prescribe rules of how people ought to write so as to prevent the corruption of the language) coupled with its latinization (its description of a given language after the pattern of Latin grammar.) In contrast to the traditional approach , the structural grammar attempts at ' scientific ' investigation of language . Structuralists look at language primarily as speech , structurally as a set of skills or habits , and functionally as the most important means of communication and a means of social control , and as contextualized systematic sounds.

Structural analysis of English syntax divides the parts of speech into form class and function words . Categories of form class words are indentified on the basis of the following criteria : 1 . Inflectional paradigm 2 . derivational paradigm 3 . Intonation pattern 4 . word order. There are four categories of form class words : nouns , verbs , adjectives , and adverbs . Function words are categorized on the basis of their use with certain form class words and their use in sentence patterns . The principal categories are determiners , auxiliary verbs , qualifiers , prepositions , conjunctions , subordinators , and interrogatives . Several methods of phrase and

sentence analysis have been used by structuralists . The most influential methods is called immediate constituent (IC) analysis . IC analysis (1) cuts a sentence into its principal parts or constituent (2) identifies the resulting structures , and (3) defines the function of each in relation to the other structures in the sentence . This process continues until the ultimate constituents are reached and identified . This type of sentence – analysis became popular in American structuralism . IC analysis is L . Bloomfield most important contribution to the study of language , having an impact on later grammar models . The importance of IC analysis is that it clearly demonstrates that sentences are not mere left-to-right linear sequences of elements ; on the contrary the elements enter into relationships of great complexity and varying kinds . By using an IC technique grammatical descriptions may be made of different interpretations of some ambiguous utterances.

The structuralists tried to make the study of language as objective and precise as possible by devising rigorous methods of segmenting and classifying the elements of a language . In syntax , this led to a method of analysis called “ Immediate Constituent Analysis ” , in which a sentence was subdivided progressively into smaller pieces of segments by bracketing . The structuralists were largely responsible for discrediting traditional grammar , because they insisted that language should be studied objectively as it is , rather than as dogmatists thought it “ ought ” to be . Transformational Grammar , founded by Noan Chomsky (syntactic structures , 1957) , in its turn discredited the structuralist school . The structuralists , in their enthusiasm for objectivity , insisted that the study of language should be based on an observable corpus of utterances . Chomsky argued that this was an impossible procedure , since language is basically an abstract mental phenomenon : every native speaker has a built-in competence or knowledge of his language , and intuitively knows far more about it than can be derived from the structuralist’s method of segmenting observed utterances . We should therefore make use of the native speaker’s intuition , and try to account for it in terms of a system of roles , explaining , for example , the native speaker’s ability to distinguish grammatical from ungrammatical sentences , to recognize equivalences between different constructions (such as active and passive sentences) , and so on . For this explanation , Chomsky found it necessary to postulate two kinds of rules : not only phrase structure rules (corresponding to the Immediate Constituent Analysis of the structuralists) , but Transformational Rules (which transfer elements from one part of structure to another , delete certain elements.) structural grammar is also inadequate when faced with sentences like : ‘ visiting relatives can be a nuisance . ’ A similar examples is : ‘ The shooting of the hunters was terrible. ’ In sentences like these there is no basis for assigning two different IC analysis , nor is there any word in the sentence which can be said to have two different meanings . Again , one must look to deep structural differences of TG. . Perhaps the most transformationalist challenge concerned the effectiveness of IC analysis . While IC analysis was capable of demonstrating some of the

relationships in English sentences patterns . It provided no basis for analysis of the differences between sentences where the pattern were the same but the relationships different . Transformationalists pointed to sentences like : John is easy to please , John is eager to please . There seems to be no grounds within structural grammar for assigning different representations to these sentences. . The ambiguity of the sentences can not be accounted for by simple IC analysis . Transformationalists insisted that some means should be found to point up the very real difference in the sentences—in the first sentence , others could please John ; in the second John sought to please others . The sentences are understood differently because they have different “ transformational histories. ” On the surface they have the same structure , but these structures are derived from different underlying or deep structures . The hallmark of TG is the emphasis on these two levels of sentence interpretation . The surface level , directly related to the sentence as it is heard , and the deep level , directly related to the meaning of the sentence . According to the structuralist view , language is system or form . Within this system , its units at all levels are interlocked into two types of relationship : syntagmatic and paradigmatic . In language learning , a structuralist argument is that a child acquires its first language through a process of repetition and reinforcement , a process in which it responds to stimuli arising in social contexts . The argument is also known as behaviorisms . According to this behaviorists principle , everything that is commonly described as being the product of the human mind – including language can be satisfactorily accounted for in terms of the reinforcement and conditioning of purely physiological reflexes ; ultimately , in terms of habits , or stimulus-response patterns . N . Chomsky , once a structuralist himself , ‘ revolutionized the scientific study of language , ’ (J . Lyons : Chomsky) by developing together with others a new type of language theory—generativism and has turned out to be an enduring opponent of this behaviorists psychology . Chomsky claimed that language simply is not a set of “ habits ” and is radically different from animal communication.

In contrast with the structuralist idea that the child learns its native language by repeating and then reproducing , in whole or part , the utterances of adult speakers , generativism maintains that language systems are productive in that they allow the child to understand and speak many many utterances it has never before heard or used . As human languages all have the property of recursiveness , the set of possible utterances in any given language is , in fact , infinite in number . If the child is able to produce new utterances of its own , recognized by other users of the language as grammatically well-formed , then there must be something other than imitation involved.

N . Chomsky considers the child’s creativity in the use of language—freedom from stimulus control , a language to be a set (finite or infinite) of sentences , each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements . In other words , a language system is thought to be composed of an inventory of elements , a vocabulary of units and the rules which determine the well-formedness on both levels of sound and grammar.

In the treatment of language, TG grammar claims to be an advance to structuralism, while the latter takes it as its task to present a record of data of usage and describe language as what language really is, the former seems as its own, in addition to an objective observation and description of language, the task of formulizing linguistic patterns which generate all and only grammatical sentences and of suggesting an explanatory hypothesis concerning the linguistic data, native of language and ultimately of human thought.

Chomsky's distinction between competence and performance is quite close to Saussurean difference between *la langue* and *parole*. They both subscribe to the fiction of the homogeneity of the language system, as the major concern of linguistics. However, they are quite far apart from each other in their treatment of syntactic rules. Saussure regards the sentences of a language as instances of *parole*, and talks of a system of relations as *la langue* and says little or nothing about the rules that are required to generate sentences. Chomsky, on the other hand, has insisted from the outset that the capacity to produce and to understand syntactically well-formed sentences is the central part of a speaker's linguistic competence. In this respect, Chomsky's generativism undoubtedly constitutes an advance upon Saussurean structuralism.

In ways to begin language analysis, Structuralists follow an approach that insists on slow, painstaking data-gathering and analysis; transformationalists observe languages and theorize about the general principles involved in producing language. This theory is revised where necessary, tested again, and so on. The fact remains that the study of language has been unalterably affected by the theory. The information and insights gained in following this line of investigation have been enormously significant in many fields. The hybrid disciplines—psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and so on—have drawn heavily on generative theory. English teaching and textbooks have been greatly affected.

It is commonplace to talk of the Chomsky 'revolution' and indeed the disciples of Chomsky are conscious of a great gulf between the past and themselves; to them structuralism represents a kind of Dark Ages. Yet no revolution is a holocaust and we must beware of imagining that linguistics began with Chomsky. His debt to the past is great. The idea of ordered rules, for example, dates from Panini—published in 20th century by Bloomfield who in fact adopted a type of morphophonemic generative approach, the idea of IC is due to Bloomfield, if not earlier; Besides this, the concept of classes (of words, morphemes, etc.), the notions of morphemes and phonemes themselves and the battery of grammatical categories—all develop in the structuralist era—are conserved in the grammar of syntactic structures type.

In sum, TG grammar together with some other grammars makes important contributions to understanding language, its nature and the way a language is used.

References

- 1 . Barry , Anita K . English grammar . language as human behavior . New Jersey : Prentice Hall , 1998
- 2 . Chomsky , N . Syntactic structures . The Hague . Mouton . 2002 . On nature and language . Cambridge : Cambridge University Press , 1957
- 3 . Cook , Vivian and Mark Newson . Chomsky's Universal Grammar . An Introduction . Beijing : Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press , 2000
- 4 . Herndon , Jeanne H . A survey of modern grammars . N.Y. : Holt , Rinehart and WINSTON , 1970
- 5 . Radford , Andrew . Transformational Grammar . A First Course . Beijing : Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press . 2000