

学校编码: 10384

分类号\_\_\_\_\_密级\_\_\_\_\_

学号: 12020130154185

UDC \_\_\_\_\_

厦门大学

博士学位论文

# 在线汉英双语专科词典的词条检索研究

-以土木工程类为例

A Study on Retrieving Entry Words in Online Specialized  
Chinese-English Bilingual Dictionaries: With Special Reference to  
Those of Civil Engineering

陈香美

指导教师姓名: 吴建平 教授

专业名称: 英语语言文学

论文提交日期:

论文答辩时间:

学位授予日期:

答辩委员会主席: \_\_\_\_\_

评 阅 人: \_\_\_\_\_

2017 年 5 月

## 厦门大学学位论文原创性声明

本人呈交的学位论文是本人在导师指导下,独立完成的研究成果。本人在论文写作中参考其他个人或集体已经发表的研究成果,均在文中以适当方式明确标明,并符合法律规范和《厦门大学研究生学术活动规范(试行)》。

另外,该学位论文为( )课题(组)的研究成果,获得( )课题(组)经费或实验室的资助,在( )实验室完成。(请在以上括号内填写课题或课题组负责人或实验室名称,未有此项声明内容的,可以不作特别声明。)

声明人(签名):  
年 月 日

厦门大学博硕士学位论文摘要库

## Abstract

Terms take up a large portion in the entry words of specialized bilingual dictionaries (hereafter referred to as "SBD"). The Chinese terms can be classified into single-character terms and multi-character terms as far as their constituents are concerned. With regard to the use of SBDs, the first step is to cut up the proper semantic units of terms from the texts they are embedded in. However, due to the feature of blurred semantic boundary in Chinese texts, it is difficult for users, especially laypeople and semi-experts, to decide from the texts where a term starts and ends especially when it is made up of several words in combination, due to the lack of bilingual terminological experience in relevant fields. Since users are likely to segment the terminological units improperly, the dictionary consultation failure is highly possible.

The current specialized lexicographical study follows mainly the Function Theory in lexicography and the theories of terminology. The Function Theory is based on defining the functions of dictionaries and focuses on users' concrete needs within specific contexts, but the study within the functional approach does not cover the variance of terminological entry words in different contexts. The theories of terminology, in contrast, focus mainly on terms and their variants and barely touch upon the concrete contexts of dictionary use. With regard to the theories of terminology, there are prescriptive and descriptive approaches. The traditional terminology study is based on the prescriptive approach, and it argues that terms should be standardized and unified in form. The modern terminology study is based on the descriptive approach, and it claims that terms may vary within different contexts and among different people. The claim indicates that different users may want different lexicographical help for terms.

This study is designed to investigate what users actually want from an SBD in terms of retrieving proper entry words from online Chinese-English SBDs (hereafter referred to as "C-E SBDs") and offer some solutions to the problems. In contrast to the traditional "user needs" study, the dissertation raises the concept of "user wants". It proposes that the user study should be user-oriented and be investigated through

empirical study. To examine what users actually want from an ideal C-E SBD regarding retrieving the proper entry words, the study creates a theoretical frame on the basis of the proposition put forward by the Communicative Theory of Terminology (hereafter referred to as “CTT”) regarding terminological variance within different contexts and the classifications of the contexts of dictionary use proposed by the Function Theory. According to the frame, the user wants are affected by the contexts of dictionary use, the texts they deal with, their language skill, their level of specialized knowledge as well as their habits of dictionary use. Based on the concept of “User Wants” within the theoretical frame, the study starts from the concrete contexts of dictionary use and tries to uncover user’s specific “Wants” regarding terminological entry words through empirical studies on layman and semi-expert users and in the non-technical and semi-technical texts. It is mainly comprised of four related parts: a formative survey on “User Wants”, a test on how users identify terms to verify the hypothetical conclusions from the formative survey, qualitative analysis on the findings from the two studies and solutions to the problems regarding retrieving entry words in an online SBD. They can be summed up as following:

Part I is a questionnaire given to subjects chosen from the universities in Fujian province that offer BA or MA programs in translation and interpreting. The questionnaire is formulated to find out four aspects relating to the contexts of SBD use among the subjects at different levels: the contexts of SBD use, the rate of SBD ownership, the problems of entry word retrieval as well as the subjects’ views on terms. Ten questions are included in this study. By analyzing the contradicting outcomes, it is found out that: 1. SBDs are mainly used in technical writings and translations; 2. SBD ownership rate is low, and users prefer searching bilingual equivalents from the internet; 3. Users want some help regarding the language for general purposes (hereafter referred to as “LGP”); 4. It is a common problem that users are unable to find the equivalents of target language for proper terms in SBDs, and the problem is mainly caused by users’ failure to identify proper terms and the unreasonable information retrieving system in SBDs; 5. The investigation also indicates that users have little credence to current SBDs.

Part II is a test on users’ terminological capacity. It is extended from the formative questionnaire. The study uses the same batch of subjects and is carried out to verify the findings from the formative survey. It is set within the context of Chinese-English

translation, and the subjects are requested to identify terms from the texts of different levels of technicality. The results of their operations are sorted into four types: “total match”, “partial match”, “not match” and “fail to identify”. By variance tests in SPSS 19.0, it is uncovered that all the four possibilities exist among different text types and terminological performance does not necessarily relate positively to users’ level of knowledge or language. The study to a great extent verifies the findings from the previous study that: users need LGP help in specialized fields according to the result of “not match”; the problem of “partial match” and “fail to identify” verify the point that users have problems with retrieving the proper terms in SBDs; when the two factors take effect in dictionary use, users would certainly lose credence of SBDs.

Part III is a qualitative analysis on the findings from Parts I and II. It is based on the issues regarding the features of the Chinese language, the characteristics of specialized knowledge of civil engineering and the use of LGP dictionaries (hereafter referred to as “LGPDs”) in the past. The compounding feature of the Chinese language makes it difficult for users to cut up the proper terminological semantic units from the text they are embedded in; the feature of specialized knowledge of civil engineering may result in users identifying anything they don’t know as terms and consult them vainly in SBDs; the use of LGPDs in the past can be another cause, as the headwords of LGPDs are single-character based and users can access through any word they don’t know for its collocations, while the entry words in SBDs are oftentimes multi-character based, and hence SBDs rely heavily on users identifying terms in complete from texts for successful information retrieval.

The fourth part is about the solutions to the problems uncovered. It proposes some measures for improving entry word retrieval for online C-E SBDs with a reference to some major online search engines as well as the concordance tools for corpus study. To settle the potential problems, we propose that a multi-character search with a spelling correcting function and visual information be included to help users find and understand proper terms. In the meantime, the study also proposes upgrading the current access strategy from the most prevailing mode of “proper entry word (the term identified by users from texts and searched in the dictionary) – context of proper entry word (the SBD presents to users)” to the mode of “user’s term (the term identified by users and searched in the dictionary) – the contexts that contain potentially-proper term (the contexts the SBD presents to users according to the search words) – proper terms

(users choose the terms that fit the text they are dealing with) – context of proper entry word (the SBD presents to users according to their choice)”, in order to maximally settle the problems arising from identifying improper terms from texts. In addition, some proposals are made on including terminology and specialized lexicography into the current translation courses.

As a lexi-giant, China has a long tradition of “large dictionary production in the heydays of social development”. The country has gone through two lexicography plannings and accumulated a lot of experience in writing dictionaries, but we still lag a long way behind a true lexi-giant, especially in the theoretical study. In the new era, the spreading of specialized knowledge has been hastened by the rapid development of information and technology, the MTI programs are increasingly shimmering up, the demand on bilingual needs from specialized fields is increasing and the third lexicographical planning is about to begin. Against such a backdrop, there is still a long way to go in terms of the theoretical study of SBDs. This dissertation thus proposes that more attention be given to the study of SBDs, and the study of C-E SBDs should be based on the features of Chinese language, the characteristics of the specialized knowledge involved as well as users’ habits in dictionary use, in order to create our own theoretical studies and write dictionaries that fit our own users. In this way we can push our own lexicographical studies ahead rather than blindly copy the theory and experience from other languages.

The innovative aspects of this study are as following:

In terms of the theoretical aspect, the concept of “User Wants” is put forward, which argues for adopting empirical studies to examine what users want from an SBD and lay a practical foundation for writing SBDs. The study is arranged in a progressively-advanced style. It starts with hypotheses from a formative survey, proceeds with an empirical study carried out to verify the conclusions and a qualitative analysis to construe the findings, and ends with some suggestions given on retrieving entry words. The whole set of methodology can be applied to SD studies of other specialized fields.

Regarding the lexicographical practice, a brand new mode of retrieving entry words is proposed. It is available with some functions from the major search engines: multi-character search, spelling correction and visual information. It also proposes upgrading the current entry word access strategy from “proper terms (users identify from texts) – contexts of proper terms (the SBD presents to users)” to “user’s term

(users identify from texts) – potentially-proper term (the SBD presents to users) – proper terms (users choose the terms that fit the text they are handling) – context of proper terms (the SBD presents to users according to their choice)”, to maximally reduce the problems arising from identifying wrong terms.

**Key Words** C-E SBD; Function Theory; CTT; “User wants”; entry word retrieval

厦门大学博硕士学位论文摘要库



## 摘 要

术语词汇在双语专科词典的词目词中占很大比例。汉语术语从构成形态上可以分为单字术语和多字术语。在双语专科词典的使用上，从语篇中提取出准确的源语术语是用户查得准确对应词的第一步。由于术语嵌入在语篇中，加上汉语言语义边界模糊的特点，要从语篇中确定出术语词汇从何始至何止对于词典用户，尤其是缺乏专门领域双语术语处理经验的非专业领域的词典用户和半专业用户来说相当困难。用户既然存在术语语义切分错误的问题，则查词失败可能性也相当大。

目前专科词典的主要研究理论有功能词典学和术语学。功能词典学以词典的功能划分为基础，主要关注用户在具体情境中的词典需求，但对术语词目词在具体情境中的具体形态则鲜有涉及。术语学则相反，其研究关注术语本身及其变体，对词典使用的具体情境则鲜有探讨。术语学研究可以分为规定术语学和描写术语学。传统的规定术语学派主张术语是标准化、统一的。现代描写术语学派则主张术语随使用情境和使用者的存在变体。该主张说明了不同用户就术语词条所需要从词典中获取的帮助不尽相同。

本研究旨在调查词典用户就检索获得恰当的术语词条问题上对汉英双语专科词典的实际需要，并就所发现的问题提出一些解决方案。不同于传统的“用户需求”研究，本文提出了“用户需要”研究，认为用户研究应当以用户为中心，通过实证来发现用户的实际“需要”。本文结合交际术语学理论关于术语在不同情境中存在不同变体的主张以及功能词典学对词典使用情境的划分构建了一个“用户需要”的理论框架。在该理论框架之下，用户的需求受到词典使用情境、文本、用户语言水平、专业知识水平以及词典使用习惯的影响。本研究以理论该框架下的“用户需要”的理念为基础，从词典使用情境的调查出发，通过实证研究来探讨专业知识水平为非专业和半专业的汉英双语专科词典用户在处理非专业和半专业文本时具体的词典“需要”。研究的主体包含四个相互关联的部分：对“用户需要”的形成性初步问卷调查、通过术语识别测试验证问卷调查所得出的结论、

调查结果定性分析以及对双语专科词典中的术语检索问题提出一些解决方案。具体如下:

第一部分: 问卷调查。选取福建省高校中的翻译专业本科生和研究生作为被试, 旨在对不同层次用户使用双语专科词典的情境、词典拥有率、查词问题、对术语的认识四个方面进行调查资料收集。问卷调查包含十个问题, 主要通过分析用户调查中出现的矛盾性结果得出: 1. 用户主要在翻译和技术写作的情境中使用双语专科词典; 2. 用户纸质词典拥有率低, 偏好网络搜索获取双语对应词; 3. 用户对专门领域有非专业词汇的需求; 4. 用户普遍存在无法从双语专科词典中找到所需要的对应词的问题, 造成这一问题的主要原因是用户对术语识别存在错误和词典中信息查询模式的不合理; 5. 用户对目前的双语专科词典缺乏使用信心。

第二部分: 术语识别测试。该部分是形成性问卷的延伸。采用与问卷调查相同的被试, 其目的是验证第一部分的假设性结论。测试以土木工程汉英翻译中双语专科词典的使用为情境, 以研究被试如何提取篇章中的术语为出发点, 对他们在不同专业层次的文本中提取术语的情况进行梳理。梳理的结果分为四类: 完全匹配、部分匹配、完全不匹配和术语遗漏。通过 SPSS 19.0 进行方差分析, 分析结果发现四类情况均存在于不同专业层次的文本中, 且被试的术语能力与被试的专业知识水平和专业领域翻译经验并非正相关。实验结果在很大程度上证实了形成性问卷所得出的假设性结论: 根据对“完全不匹配术语”的分析, 可以发现用户对专门领域有非专业术语的词汇查找需求; 用户经常无法提取准确的术语导致在词典中无法查找到准确的对应词-实验结果存在部分匹配情况; 两个因素作用之下, 用户对专科双语词典的使用信心缺失亦成为必然。

第三部分: 在实证研究的基础上, 我们以研究所涉及的语言和专业知识的特征以及用户过去使用普通语文词典的习惯为基础对前两个部分的研究结果进行定性分析。提出汉语言本身的复合性特点 (compounding), 语义切分较难。同时土木工程领域贴近日常生活但其产品的生产过程则不为非专业人士所知, 由于专业知识的缺乏, 用户往往随意将陌生的内容视为术语进行词典查阅而导致查词失败。此外, 普通语文词典的使用也会对双语专科词典的使用造成很大影响。普通语文词典以单个词汇为词目词, 而专科词典则多以术语为词目词, 普通语文词典允许用户通过某个词汇来查找其相关的搭配, 而专科词典则需要以准确完整的术语词目词来查找对应词, 用户需要查找到完整的术语才能够从词典中查找到待查信息。

第四部分:建立在形成性分析、实证研究和定性分析相结合的基础上,本研究提出双语专科词典的术语词条检索方式的改进措施。在参考目前主要搜索引擎的检索功能以及一部分多功能语料库检索工具的检索功能的基础上,本文提出双词/多词检索、错别字自动更正、图片和视频可视信息呈现的多功能词条检索以帮助用户检索和理解词条。同时研究还提出将目前的主要的词条检索方式从“标准词目词(用户从文本中提取的词汇)-标准词目词语境(专科词典提供的词汇)”的检索方式提升为“用户词目词(用户从文本中提取的词汇)-潜在词目词语境(专科词典根据用户输入的词汇提供含有相关的术语词条的语境)-标准词目词(用户根据词典提供的术语词条和实际文本中的术语的匹配情况在语境中选择标准词目词)-标准词目词语境”(专科词典根据用户选择的标准术语提供该术语的具体语境),从最大程度上解决用户因无法从语篇中提取完整术语所造成的问题。此外,本文还对翻译教学中增加术语课程以及专科词典学课程提出一些见解。

我国秉承“盛世修典”的传统,是一个辞书生产大国,经历了两次辞书规划,也积累了大量辞书编纂经验,但离真正的辞书大国还有很大距离,尤其在理论上还有待提高。当前信息化迅速发展,专门领域信息传播加速,国内翻译硕士培养不断升温,双语专科词典的需求也将不断提升,与此同时,第三次辞书规划也呼之欲出。在此背景之下,专科词典理论发展仍严重落后。研究提出应当立足汉语言的特征、专门学科领域的特点以及用户的词典使用习惯,研究编写出适合本国用户使用的词典,为我国辞书发展谋求适合的出路,而不应盲目“拿来”国外理论和经验。

本文的创新之处:

1. 理论上提出了用户需要“user wants”的概念,主张从用户的实际词典使用中了解用户之所需,为双语专科词典编写打下实证基础。本文从形成性问卷调查得出的假定性结论出发,通过实证研究对该假定性结论进行验证,再通过定性分析论证并提出解决方案。这种渐进的研究模式也适用于其他领域的专科词典。

2. 在词典编纂方面,结合目前的主要搜索引擎所具备的检索功能以及一部分多功能语料库检索工具的相关功能,提出多词检索、错别字自动更正、可视信息呈现的词条检索模式,同时提出将目前的主要检索方式从“标准词目词(用户从文本中提取的词汇)-标准词目词(专科词典提供的词汇)语境”的检索方式提升为“用户词目词(用户从文本中提取的词汇)-潜在词目词语境(专科词典根据用

户输入的词汇提供相关的术语词条) - 标准词目词(用户根据词典提供的术语词条和实际文本中的术语的匹配情况选择标准词目词) - 标准词目词语境”(专科词典根据用户选择的标准术语提供该术语的具体语境),从最大程度上解决因用户从语篇中提取术语出错而造成的问题。

**关键词** 汉英双语专科词典; 功能词典学; 交际术语学; 用户需要; 词目词检索

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>摘要</b> .....	<b>VI</b>
<b>目录</b> .....	<b>X</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>XXIV</b>
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 The motivation of this study</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1.1 The feature of the Chinese language and users' problems regarding identifying proper terms from texts.....	1
1.1.2 The impacts from using LGPDs.....	2
1.1.3 The features of the knowledge of civil engineering.....	3
1.1.4 The huge bilingual needs.....	4
1.1.5 The changed user profile regarding language skill and specialized knowledge .....	5
1.1.6 The shortage of theoretical studies.....	8
<b>1.2 Rationales of retrieving entry words from online C-E SBDs of civil engineering</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>1.3 Terminological establishment</b> .....	<b>9</b>
1.3.1 Terminology.....	9
1.3.2 Definition of "term".....	11
1.3.2.1 Definitions by both traditional and modern terminology schools.....	12
1.3.2.2 Definition of "term" in traditional Terminology.....	12
1.3.2.3 Definition of "term" by modern Terminology study.....	14
1.3.2.4 Definition of "Terminology" and "term" in China.....	15
1.3.2.5 A tentative definition of "term".....	15
1.3.3 Specialized field.....	16
1.3.3.1 About specialized field.....	16

1.3.3.2	Defining the specialized field of civil engineering.....	18
<b>1.4</b>	<b>The aim of this study.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>1.5</b>	<b>The organization of this dissertation.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>A Literature Review on C-E SBD Study in China</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>SBDs in China.....</b>	<b>23</b>
2.1.1	Lexicographical practice.....	23
2.1.1.1	Paper dictionaries.....	23
2.1.1.2	E-dictionaries or online dictionaries.....	26
2.1.2	Theoretical studies of SBDs.....	26
2.1.3	Summary.....	30
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Typology of SDs.....</b>	<b>31</b>
2.2.1	Yang Zuxi and Xu Qingkai's typology.....	32
2.2.2	Sun Yingchun's typology.....	33
2.2.3	Huang Zhonglian and Li Yashu's typology.....	33
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Problems regarding entry words in C-E SBDs.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>35</b>
2.4.1	The achievements and problems.....	35
2.4.2	Problems of lexicographical typology.....	35
2.4.3	Problems in retrieving entry words.....	36
2.4.4	The applicability of European theory in writing C-E SBDs.....	36
2.4.5	What should be included in C-E SBDs.....	36
2.4.6	A tentative proposal for writing SBD study.....	37
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Theoretical Considerations.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Terminological approach.....</b>	<b>39</b>
3.1.1	General Terminology Theory.....	39
3.1.2	Socioterminology.....	40
3.1.3	Communicative theory of terminology.....	41
3.1.4	Sociocognitive terminology.....	41
3.1.5	Frame-based terminology.....	42
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Functional approach.....</b>	<b>43</b>
3.2.1	User profile.....	43

3.2.2	Consultation-related user characteristics.....	44
3.2.3	Dictionary function based on user's specific needs.....	44
3.2.3	Summary.....	44
<b>3.3</b>	<b>The integration of the two approaches.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Studies on dictionary users.....</b>	<b>47</b>
3.4.1	User wants.....	48
3.4.2	The research questions of "user wants" .....	51
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>User Investigation.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>An overview on the design issues.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Study on the context of SBD use.....</b>	<b>57</b>
4.2.1	When users need bilingual helps.....	58
4.2.1.1	Question design.....	58
4.2.1.2	Data analysis.....	58
4.2.1.3	Discussion.....	59
4.2.2	Where users seek bilingual helps.....	60
4.2.2.1	Question design.....	60
4.2.2.2	Statistical analysis.....	60
4.2.2.3	Discussion.....	61
<b>4.3</b>	<b>SBD ownership.....</b>	<b>66</b>
4.3.1	Question design.....	66
4.3.2	Statistical analysis.....	66
4.3.3	Discussion.....	67
4.3.3.1	The ownership rate of two different types of dictionaries.....	67
4.3.3.2	The popularity of electronic dictionary and paper dictionary among subjects.....	68
4.3.3.3	Summary.....	69
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Investigation on retrieving entry words from SBDs.....</b>	<b>70</b>
4.4.1	Entry word arrangement in current SBDs.....	70
4.4.2	Successfulness in retrieving what users want from SBDs.....	71
4.4.2.1	Question design.....	71

4.4.2.2	Data presentation and discussion.....	72
<b>4.5</b>	<b>SBD use.....</b>	<b>73</b>
4.5.1	User's habit of consulting entry words in paper dictionaries.....	73
4.5.1.1	Question design.....	73
4.5.1.2	Data presentation and discussion.....	74
4.5.2	SBD use in translation.....	75
4.5.2.1	Question design.....	75
4.5.2.2	Data presentation and discussion.....	76
4.5.2.3	Summary.....	77
<b>4.6</b>	<b>User's perspectives on terminology.....</b>	<b>78</b>
4.6.1	What users want from an SBD.....	78
4.6.1.1	Question design.....	78
4.6.1.2	Data analysis and discussion.....	79
4.6.1.3	Contradicting findings.....	79
4.6.1.4	The interference from the use of LGPDs and the Chinese language..	81
4.6.1.5	Impacts from the language of specialized field.....	81
4.6.1.6	Summary.....	83
4.6.2	An interview on the definition of "terms".....	83
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>84</b>
4.7.1	The functions and primary feature of SBDs.....	84
4.7.2	What users want in terms of retrieving entry words.....	85
4.7.3	Problems underlying an unsuccessful dictionary consultation.....	86
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>User's Terminological Capacity.....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Introduction to the study.....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Foundations of this study.....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>About the study.....</b>	<b>93</b>
5.3.1	Objectives.....	93
5.3.2	Design issues.....	94
5.3.3	Subjects.....	94
5.3.4	Test material.....	97
5.3.5	Control factors.....	99



Degree papers are in the "[Xiamen University Electronic Theses and Dissertations Database](#)". Full texts are available in the following ways:

1. If your library is a CALIS member libraries, please log on <http://etd.calis.edu.cn/> and submit requests online, or consult the interlibrary loan department in your library.
2. For users of non-CALIS member libraries, please mail to [etd@xmu.edu.cn](mailto:etd@xmu.edu.cn) for delivery details.

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库