

学校编码: 10384

学号: 12020121152605

分类号

UDC

密级

\_\_\_\_\_

厦门大学

硕士学位论文

## 基于语料库的汉英同传言据性的研究

A Corpus-based Study of Evidentiality in Chinese-English  
Simultaneous Interpreting

肖潇

肖潇

指导教师姓名: 肖晓燕 教授

专业名称: 英语语言文学

论文提交日期: 2015年4月

论文答辩日期: 2015年 月

学位授予日期: 2015年 月

指导教师

肖晓燕 教授

答辩委员会主席: \_\_\_\_\_

评阅人: \_\_\_\_\_

厦门大学

2015年5月

基于语料库的汉英同传言据性的研究

厦门大学博士论文摘要库



## 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



## 厦门大学学位论文著作权使用声明

本人同意厦门大学根据《中华人民共和国学位条例暂行实施办法》等规定保留和使用此学位论文，并向主管部门或其指定机构送交学位论文（包括纸质版和电子版），允许学位论文进入厦门大学图书馆及其数据库被查阅、借阅。本人同意厦门大学将学位论文加入全国博士、硕士学位论文共建单位数据库进行检索，将学位论文的标题和摘要汇编出版，采用影印、缩印或者其它方式合理复制学位论文。

本学位论文属于：

1. 经厦门大学保密委员会审查核定的保密学位论文，  
于 年 月 日解密，解密后适用上述授权。

2. 不保密，适用上述授权。

（请在以上相应括号内打“√”或填上相应内容。保密学位论文应是已经厦门大学保密委员会审定过的学位论文，未经厦门大学保密委员会审定的学位论文均为公开学位论文。此声明栏不填写的，默认为公开学位论文，均适用上述授权。）

声明人（签名）：

年 月 日



## Abstract

Evidentiality as an important and pervasive linguistic phenomenon has attracted much of scholars' attention from various disciplines. Recently, remarkable achievements have been made in this area. However, previous studies have been devoted to examining evidentiality in the oral and written genre with little attention paid to the study of evidentiality in simultaneous interpreting. Besides, studies on translation universals mainly engage in translational English or translated Chinese with a focus on lexical density, information load, sentence structure, collocations etc.. Few have contributed to the research of evidentiality in the interpreted texts, leaving a vacancy to be filled.

In order to verify translation universals in the interpreted texts from the aspect of evidentiality, this thesis aims to explore distribution features of evidentiality in the source-Chinese, interpreted-English and source-English texts based on the nine panel discussions of Summer Davos 2011. To start with, crouching on the previous academic efforts, classification suitable for the study of evidentiality in Chinese-English simultaneous interpreting is put forward. Six types of evidentiality are examined including belief, induction, deduction, hearsay, reliability and expectation. Then, distribution features of six types of evidentials in the three sub-corpora are explored. Subsequently, divergences in the occurrence and frequency in the three sub-corpora are examined in detail. The findings are as follows: (1) interpreters apply less belief and expectation evidentials than both English and Chinese speakers do while prefer to adopt common used words, showing a tendency of simplification; (2) interpreters, influenced by the target-language culture, observe norms in native English by using more reliability evidentials that are less certain in degrees, which shows a tendency of normalization; (3) interpreters employ hearsay evidentials more frequently than both English and Chinese speakers do. In other words, interpreters consciously add information to explain how they acquire the knowledge,

reflecting a tendency of explicitation; (4) interpreters, influenced by source Chinese, use more deduction and less induction evidentials than English speakers do.

**Key Words:** Chinese-English SI; evidentiality; evidential; corpus

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库



## 摘要

言据性作为一种重要而又普遍的语言现象一直广受学者的关注。近年来,有关言据性的研究取得了丰硕成果。然而以往对言据性的研究主要集中在口语和写作等方面,少有学者关注同声传译跨语言交际中的言据性特征。此外,翻译学科中对译语是否符合翻译共性假设的研究也主要集中在英语译语或汉语译语,考察译语中连接词汇,平均句长以及信息载量等方面,鲜少关注言据性在译文中所呈现的特征。

为进一步验证言据性在汉英同声传译中的特征是否符合翻译共性的假设,本文以 2011 年夏季达沃斯论坛 9 场小组讨论的同声传译语料为依托,分析言据性在汉语源语,英语译语以及英语源语中的分布特征。首先基于以往对言据性的分类研究,本文提出了适用于汉英同传的分类体系,考察了信念、归纳、演绎、传言、信度和预期六大据素。在此基础上利用语料库工具对上述两个子库中言据性出现的频数和频率差异进行分析。研究发现如下:(1)译员较少使用信念和预期据素,且表达形式单一,频繁使用常用词,表明译文呈简化趋势;(2)译员受目标语文化影响,遵从英语母语发言人的习惯,多用较为保守的信度据素,译文呈范化趋势;(3)译员更频繁地使用传言据素,有意识地添加信息使译文更加明确,译文呈现显化趋势;(4)受汉语源语影响,译员与英语发言人相比较更多地使用演绎据素,较少使用推断据素。

**关键词:** 汉英同传 言据性 据素 语料

# Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>摘要</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Research Background .....	1
1.2 Research Questions and Significance of the Study .....	3
1.3 Research Methodology .....	4
1.4 Thesis Structure .....	4
<b>Chapter 2 Literature Review</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1 Definition and Classification of Evidentiality .....	6
2.1.1 Previous Studies Abroad .....	6
2.1.2 Previous Studies in China .....	14
2.2 Discourse Features of Evidentiality .....	21
2.2.1 Cognitive Perspective .....	23
2.2.2 Genre and Cultural Perspective .....	23
2.2.3 Pragmatic Perspective .....	24
2.3 A Review of Studies on Translation Universals.....	26
2.4 A Review of Corpus-based Interpreting Studies.....	32
2.5 Summary .....	35
<b>Chapter 3 Theoretical Framework</b> .....	<b>36</b>
3.1 Functions of Evidentiality.....	36
3.1.1 Three Metafunctions of Language .....	36
3.1.2 Interpersonal Functions of Evidentiality.....	36
3.2 Comparison of Chafe’s Model and Hu’s Model .....	40
3.3 Classification of Evidentiality in the Current Study .....	42
3.4 Explaining Types of Evidentials with Examples.....	43

<b>3.5 Summary</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>Chapter 4 Research Methodology</b> .....	<b>49</b>
<b>4.1 Introducing the Corpus</b> .....	<b>49</b>
4.1.1 The Summer Davos Simultaneous Interpreting Corpus .....	49
4.1.2 Data Collection and Transcription .....	50
4.1.3 Sub-corpora for Use in the Current Study .....	52
4.1.4 Corpus Tools and Statistical Measurements .....	53
<b>4.2 Research Procedures</b> .....	<b>54</b>
<b>4.3 Summary</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>Chapter 5 Results and Discussion</b> .....	<b>56</b>
<b>5.1 Distribution of Evidentials in the Three Sub-corpora</b> .....	<b>56</b>
<b>5.2 Differences of the Distribution of Evidentials in the Three Sub-corpora</b> ...	<b>58</b>
5.2.1 Belief.....	58
5.2.2 Reliability.....	60
5.2.3 Hearsay .....	62
5.2.4 Induction .....	64
5.2.5 Deduction.....	65
5.2.6 Expectation .....	66
<b>5.3 Potential Causes for the Differences</b> .....	<b>68</b>
<b>5.4 Summary</b> .....	<b>69</b>
<b>Chapter 6 Conclusion</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>6.1 Major Findings of the Study</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>6.2 Limitations of the Study</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>6.3 Suggestions for Future Research</b> .....	<b>71</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>72</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>79</b>

# 目录

<b>Abstract</b> .....	错误！未定义书签。
<b>摘要</b> .....	错误！未定义书签。
<b>第一章 引言</b> .....	错误！未定义书签。
1.1 研究背景 .....	错误！未定义书签。
1.2 研究问题及研究意义 .....	错误！未定义书签。
1.3 研究方法 .....	错误！未定义书签。
1.4 本文结构 .....	错误！未定义书签。
<b>第二章 文献综述</b> .....	错误！未定义书签。
2.1 言据性的定义及分类 .....	错误！未定义书签。
2.1.1 国外研究回顾.....	错误！未定义书签。
2.1.2 国内研究回顾.....	错误！未定义书签。
2.2 言据性的语篇特征 .....	错误！未定义书签。
2.2.1 认知语言学视角.....	错误！未定义书签。
2.2.2 体裁及文化视角.....	错误！未定义书签。
2.2.3 语用学视角.....	错误！未定义书签。
2.3 翻译共性研究回顾 .....	错误！未定义书签。
2.4 口译语料库研究回顾 .....	错误！未定义书签。
2.5 小结 .....	错误！未定义书签。
<b>第三章 理论框架</b> .....	错误！未定义书签。
3.1 言据性的功能 .....	错误！未定义书签。
3.1.1 语言的三大元功能.....	错误！未定义书签。
3.1.2 言据性的人际功能.....	错误！未定义书签。
3.2 Chafe 模式和胡壮麟模式对比.....	错误！未定义书签。
3.3 本研究中的言据性分类 .....	错误！未定义书签。

3.4 本研究言据性分类详解.....	错误! 未定义书签。
3.5 小结 .....	47
<b>第四章 研究方法 .....</b>	<b>错误! 未定义书签。</b>
4.1 语料库简介 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
4.1.1 夏季达沃斯同声传译语料库.....	错误! 未定义书签。
4.1.2 数据收集及转写 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
4.1.3 本研究采用的子库.....	52
4.1.4 语料库研究工具和统计测量.....	错误! 未定义书签。3
4.2 研究步骤 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
4.3 小结 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
<b>第五章 结果与分析 .....</b>	<b>错误! 未定义书签。</b>
5.1 三字库中言据性类型总分布 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
5.2 三子库中言据性的分布差异 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
5.2.1 信念据素 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
5.2.2 信度据素 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
5.2.3 传言据素 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
5.2.4 推断据素 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
5.2.5 演绎据素 .....	65
5.2.6 预期据素 .....	66
5.3 言据性分布差异的原因分析 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
5.4 小结 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
<b>第六章 结论 .....</b>	<b>70</b>
6.1 研究结论总结 .....	70
6.2 本研究的局限性 .....	70
6.3 后续研究展望 .....	错误! 未定义书签。
<b>参考文献.....</b>	<b>错误! 未定义书签。</b>
<b>致谢.....</b>	<b>错误! 未定义书签。</b>



## Chapter 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Research Background

Evidentiality is an important and pervasive linguistic phenomenon. In the narrow sense, it refers to the expression of the source of information while in the broad sense, it also embodies the speaker's assessment of the knowledge (Chafe, 1986). Every language has some way of making reference to the source of information or coding speakers' assessment of the epistemological status of their information (Mushin, 2001), which makes evidentiality full of academic and practical values.

Much of the original interest in evidentiality is aroused by American Indian languages, and especially those of Northern California, in which the marking of evidentiality through verb suffixes is widespread (Chafe & Nichols, 1986).

Boas is deemed as the first one to use the term "evidentiality" in descriptive linguistics (Jacobsen, 1986). Boas (1947: 206) describes it as "a small group of suffixes expressing source and certainty of knowledge..." Sapir (1911: 114) also notices "how frequently the form expresses the source or nature of the speaker's knowledge". Swadesh (1939: 82) groups the quotative and the inferential together as "mode of evidence" and places the label "evidential" over forms of the inferential in the analysis of the language "Nootka". Lee (1938: 89) deals with the interpretation of Wintu grammatical categories and refers to it by labels such as "suffixes giving the source of information". Hoijer (1954: 10) discovers evidential phenomena in some Indian languages: "the technique, in a number of languages, whereby statements are classed as known from the speaker's experience, from hearsay, or from cultural tradition".

Jakobson (1957:392) introduces the term "evidential" as a "tentative label" for the generic verbal category. He suggests four possible sources of evidential information: someone else's report (quotative, i.e., hearsay evidence), a guess (presumptive evidence), and one's own previous experience (memory evidence) (Jacobsen, 1986).

In the spring of 1981, the first conference on evidentiality was held in Berkeley. Consequently, *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, the first collection of papers on evidentiality is published, which has far-reaching impact on further studies in this field. Since then, evidentiality has become an established research topic in linguistics (Dendale & Tasmowski, 2001).

Domestically, a few scholars have also paid attention to evidentiality. Hu (胡壮麟, 1994) brings into different definition and models of evidentiality, employs Chafe's theory to analyze Chinese evidentials (胡壮麟, 1995) and illustrates differences of evidentials in genre of news reports and debates (胡壮麟, 1994). Zhang (张伯江, 1997), Yan (严辰松, 2000) and Niu (牛保义, 2005) also introduce the theory of evidentiality and evidentials. Zhu (朱永生, 2006) proposes his analysis of Chinese evidentials according to Aikhenvald's model. Fang (房红梅, 2006) adopts a systematic-functional approach to evidentiality.

Although evidential studies have attracted attention from scholars across various disciplines, little attention has been paid to this area in the discipline of corpus-based interpreting studies. The new discipline in combination of corpus tools and methods with interpreting studies is put forward in the late 1990s which offers a tool "both viable and revelatory not only for the study of interpreting, per se, but for translation studies as a whole" (Shlesinger, 1998). Generally speaking, corpus-based interpreting studies, based on the constructed monolingual, parallel or comparable corpora, mainly focus on two themes: the study of linguistic features of interpreted texts and observation and analysis of interpreting processing (张威, 2012).

To be specific, the study of linguistic features indicates the identification of lexical characteristics such as lexical density and variety, high-frequency words, concordances, lexical collocations and co-occurrences etc. in comparable texts as evidence of translation universals including explicitation, simplification and normalization or conventionalization (Sergio & Falbo, 2012).

More specifically, explicitation reflects a tendency to make translation more explicit by adding background information or other materials. Simplification refers to the idea that translator subconsciously simplify the language or message or both.



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.

廈門大學博碩士論文摘要庫