Research into Application Comparison of Chinese and German

Wang Yu

Nanchang Institute of Science & Technology

Keywords: Chinese; German; Application Comparison; Common Verbs; Coordination Valence

Abstract. Chinese and German belong to two different language families: one belongs to the Sino-Tibetan language family and another belongs to the Indo-European language family, but both Chinese and German grammar scholars have conducted in-depth research into their own language with the coordination valence and obtained certain results. Therefore, there is a theoretical support for the comparative research into Chinese verbs and German verbs. This paper is an applicative microcosmic study comparing the similarities and differences between common Chinese verbs and German verbs with Chinese as the comparison base and German as the comparative reference. It specifically analyzes the corresponding relationship between Chinese verbs and German verbs with similar meanings in coordination valence, and summarizes some translation rules between the internal case of Chinese verbs and German verb complements.

Introduction

Research into application comparison of Chinese and German verb coordination valence plays a guiding role on teaching Chinese to German adults, which is very significant that cannot be ignored. In foreign language teaching, people gradually realize that in order to master a foreign language, we must first understand its characteristics, and the most effective way is to compare the characteristics of target language with one's own mother tongue, so that it is beneficial for teachers to determine the focus and difficulties in teaching, make teaching more predictable and targeted and improve teaching effectiveness.

In addition to being directly applied to compiling Chinese grammar teaching in Germany, comparative research into Chinese and German coordination valence can also make scholars studying Chinese coordination valence have a more in-depth understanding of the research and application results of German coordination valence. They may have a clearer understanding of the similarities between Chinese and German coordination valence and characteristics of the Chinese language.

From this paper, it can be known that it is not feasible to formulate a set of comprehensive translation rules from sentence structure, because unlike German, Chinese does not have such developed morphological marker, so it is impossible to derive comprehensive Chinese syntactic-semantic model. Coordination valence teaching of specific verbs should be strengthened in teaching Chinese in German without paying too much attention to teaching syntax theory, so that problems can be solved more effectively and twice the results can be obtained with half the effort.

Necessity of Application Comparison of Chinese and German

Nowadays, there is a "fever" to learn Chinese. In Germany, there are more than 80 universities and 60 middle schools teaching Chinese with at least 1,000 college students learning Chinese. Chinese is attracting more and more learners from all over the world with its rich cultural heritage and unique charm of language.

In the process of teaching Chinese as a foreign language, there is a prevalent saying that "it is difficult to learn Chinese", because Chinese is such a language extremely rich of characteristics. Foreign students will inevitably compare Chinese with their own mother tongues, especially in learning Chinese grammar. They usually use verbs in their own mother tongue with the similar meaning to replace a corresponding Chinese verb.

Compared with the rich results of comparing Chinese and Japanese as well as Chinese and

English, there is a very embarrassing situation for the current research into the application of German in China among the Chinese grammar circle: ever before 2002, only Mr. Qian Wencai had published a "Research into Application Comparison of Chinese and Germany" in 2001, which targeted at all those Chinese learning German and comprehensively described the corresponding relationship between Chinese and German in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, sentence and discourse structure, etc. Later on, although there are many researches in this field, they are basically targeting at Germans who are learning Chinese with Chinese as the comparison base and German as the comparison reference, and it is still blank in China's grammar circle to study the application comparison of Chinese and German coordination valence, so until today, research into application comparison of Chinese and German still develops slowly.

Feasibility of Application Comparison of Chinese and German verbs in Terms of Coordination Valence

Each nation has roughly the same understanding of the nature and social phenomenon and they can use their own respective language to express their understanding of this as well as use the thinking tool of language to reflect the same objective world.

In different languages, the same concept has the same amount of valences when they represent logical valence, which is determined by the logical relationship of words. The core concept of a word reflects the relationship between various phenomenons in reality in addition to language. For example, the Chinse word "拜访" refers to the relationship between visitors and the one being visited. It has two vacancies (in German: Leerstelle, a unit referring to semantic relations), so it is divalent. The German word "besuchen" (visit) also refers to the relationship between visitors and the one being visited, so it is also divalent. It is worth noting that logical valence also has other different names, such as logic-semantic valence, and semantic valence, etc. In different languages, the same concept refers to different syntactic valence and semantic valence. Syntactic valence refers to the demonstration of logic valence in a certain language.

Semantic valence refers to whether the complement (English: "actant") is semantically compatible. For example, the Chinese word "拜访" is semantically compatible with the subject "he" and the object "Teacher Zhao". The German word "besuchen" corresponds to the first case complement "er" of the subject "he" and the fourth case complement "HerrnZha" of the object "Teacher Zhao", which are equally semantically compatible.

Analysis of Application Comparison

German has strict morphological changes, and Engel/Schumacher only give the sentence structure of verbs in "Small Dictionary" but no (not necessary) syntax format of similar coordination modes. However, in order to case stronger visual impact on students as well as bring more German syntactic information to scholars of Chinese coordination valence, I think it is better to list the German verb complement syntax array format.

This paper mainly regards the sentence structure of German verbs as the order and specifically compares the application of Chinese and similar German words (or verb phrases) in complement/amount of inner cases (case number), complement/semantic properties of inner case (semantic properties), basic syntax and pragmatic syntax, etc.

Table 1

Verb	Case amount	Semantic property	Basic syntax format	Pragmatic syntax format
geben	3	E。，El，E3	Sa:0++3+1 Yiqinggibtmirdas Bueh.	Sb:3++0+1 MirgibtYiqingdas BUeh. Se:l++0+3 DasBuehgibtYiqing mlr。
给	3	A，P，D	51:A++D+P 义青~我这本书 S2:A+把 P+_了+D 义青把这本书~了我。	53:P+A++D 这本书义青~我。 54:P+被 A+_了+D 这本书被义青~了我。

It can be known from the above that in "give something to somebody so that somebody has the right of control", "give" has the same coordination valence in Chinese and German.

The German word "geben" has the same amount of inner cases with the Chinese word "给".

The first case complement O in German is equivalent to the object A in Chinese, the fourth case complement 1 in German is equivalent to the object P in Chinese, and the third case complement 3 is equivalent to the object case D in Chinese.

Sb, 52 and 54 are different to a large extent. If there are translated into Chinese strictly according to the Sb syntax format, this sentence means "I give this book to Yiqing". Sb is a specific phenomenon in German syntax because "I" is the third case here, so obviously, it cannot serve as the subject but as the indirect object while the real subject is "Yiqing" right the verb. S4 is a passive sentence in Chinese, which can be replaced by the German passive voice:DasBuchwirdvon Yiqingmirgegeben. S2 is the "give" sentence in Chinese, characteristic of Chinese.

Conclusion

From the above specific application comparison of verbs, the following rules can be summarized:

Most Chinese coordination valence scholars believe that nominal composition guided by preposition cannot be included in the case. In this case, Yuan Yulin has the same opinion as Engel/Schumacher: under certain conditions, nominal composition guided by preposition can be included in the case.

In "Small Dictionary", Engel and Schumacher classify complements in details and use them to show sentence structure. In "Research into Chinese Verbs' Coordination Valence", Yuan Yulin roughly divide the semantic cases of layer, item, and position at the valence layer and use them to express the semantic configuration of verbs.

German and Chinese are distinctly different in word order: German is a language with developed language morphological markers, so the order of complements and description in syntactic structure is strictly limited.

References

[1] S. Mahdihassan. A Comparative Study of the Word Sugar and of Its Equivalents in Hindustani as Traceable to Chinese [J]. American Journal of Chinese Medicine, 1981, 9(3):187-92.

[2] Tian X J. The Curriculum Layout for the Master's Degree Program of Foreign Linguistics and Applied Linguistics [J]. Journal of Luoyang Normal University, 2009.

[3] Hou S S. Network Architecture and Functional Development of the Foreign Linguistics Teaching Platform [J]. Advanced Materials Research, 2014, 971-973:2587-2590.

[4] Qin R. A Comparative Study on the Implementation System of the Arbitral Awards between the Chinese and German Legal System [J]. Nankai Journal, 2010, 02(4).

[5] Flege J E. A critical period for learning to pronounce foreign languages?' Applied Linguistics 8(2[J]. Applied Linguistics, 1987, 8(2):162-177.

[6] Caspers J. The influence of erroneous stress position and segmental errors on intelligibility, comprehensibility and foreign accent in Dutch as a second language [J]. Linguistics in the Netherlands, 2010, 27(1):17-29.

[7] Twaddell F. A Focus Report: Linguistics and Foreign‑Language Teaching[J]. Foreign Language Annals, 2008, 4(2):194-199.

[8] Victor E. Hanzeli †. Linguistics and the Language Teacher [J]. Foreign Language Annals, 1968, 2(2):42-50.

[9] Kadler E H. Linguistics and teaching foreign languages [J]. Modern Language Journal, 1972, 56(1).

[10]Lane H, Grosjean F, Leberre J, et al. Linguistics [J]. Linguistics, 1973(112):15-22.

[11]Berber S A P. Corpus linguistics and second/foreign language learning: exploring multiple paths [J]. Revista Brasileira De Lingu ística Aplicada, 2010, 11(2):459-477.

[12]Aronoff M. Foreign Literatures and Linguistics [J]. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1974, 53(4):9-22.