口译场合: 英语演讲

Objectives of study:

- 1. Learn the differences between English and Chinese in terms of intonation, pronunciation and speech flow for the purpose of interpreting.
- 2. Practice listening and speaking skills for the purpose of interpreting.
 - 3. Practice listening comprehension for the purpose of interpreting.

一、口译技能训练

Listen to the following audio clips one by one. In the first listening, please practice speaking after each sentence and try to imitate the pronunciation and intonation in the original speech. Then listen again and try to retell the information you've got from each speech segment. Don't forget to close the textbook while practicing. You may check your listening comprehension against the transcripts afterwards.

Passage 1

Speech Scenario: In the following audio clip, Mr. Bill Gates is delivering a commencement speech in Harvard University.

ou graduates came to Harvard at a different time. You know more about the world's inequities than the classes that came before. In your years here, I hope you've had a chance to think about how—in this age of accelerating technology—we can finally take on these inequities, and we can solve them.

Passage 2

Speech Scenario: In the following audio clip, the eminent historian Professor Jonathan Spence is giving the 2008 Reith Lecture on Confucian Ways.

onfucius was a historically verifiable person, born in 551 BC, who died in 479 BC at the age of 72. He lived most of his life in the State of Lu in what today is known as Shandong Province. He was not an aristocrat, but rather a member of the scholar or professional class who managed to become a mid-level bureaucrat. He loved music and poetry, loved history and the practice of the rites, and he sought to define and practice the art of ruling. He spent fourteen of his years in wandering and only had a few fleeting years in which to practice what he preached.

Passage 3

Speech Scenario: In the following audio clip, Madam Condoleeza Rice, former US Secretary of State, speaks on her experience of Africa.

where my aunt was teaching at the university in Monrovia. I wasn't there for long. I was very young, and I frankly don't remember much. But that was in the very early 1960s and it was still the dawning hours of Africa's independence. The excitement was palpable. There was a sense that anything was possible, and that the free nations of Africa would soon take their place among the community of nations, with equal dignity, with mutual respect, and with growing opportunity for the African people. I will say that for a young girl from Birmingham, Alabama, where freedom and justice were promised but still denied, Africa's example was inspiring.

Passage 4

Speech Scenario: In the following audio clip, an official from UK Trade and Investment talks about innovation in the UK during an ICT seminar.

as a lot of you know, the UK has a long history of innovation-driven technology development. You can look back to Alexander Graham Bell and the invention of telephone, John Baird and the invention of television. Coming more recently to Tim Berners-Lee, who invented the World Wide Web. And today, UK is at the forefront of convergence in mobile wireless and broadcast communications technologies. It leads Europe as the strongest research base for ICT. The ICT industry in the UK is not as well known as we think it should be worldwide. It is an incredibly strong sector and it accounts for something like 10 percent of UK GDP. And very many of our companies are positioned right at the top of global value chain, which makes them ideal partners.

Passage 5

Speech Scenario: In the following audio clip, Mr. Al Gore, former Vice President of the US, is making a speech on energy.

There are times in the history of our nation when our very way of life depends upon dispelling illusions and awakening to the challenge of a present danger. In such moments, we are called upon to move quickly and boldly and shake off complacency, throw aside old habits and rise, clear-eyed and alert, to the necessity of making big changes. Those who, for whatever reason, refuse to do their part in such times must either be persuaded to join the effort or asked to step aside. This is such a moment. The survival of the United States of America, as we know it, is at risk. And even more— if more should be required—the future of human civilization is at stake.

二、口译技巧点拨

每一种语言都有自己独特的发音。英语和汉语分属不同的语言系统(英语属印欧语系,汉语属汉藏语系),在发音方面有着巨大的差异。了解英语

和汉语在发音方面的基本特点,有利于提高口译所必需的听辨能力。本单元 将简要介绍与英汉口译直接相关的英语和汉语在语音、语调和语流方面的差 异之处。

(1) 英语和汉语的语音差异

英语的多数音是用口腔中后部发出的,而汉语是用口腔中前部,也就是 舌尖处发音。从这一点来看,英语的发音比较接近"美声唱法",会运用到 胸腔甚至腹腔的力量,听起来较具有磁性和穿透力。

就发音时的音素而言,一般认为,英语有 48 个音素,汉语有 44 个。英语和汉语没有任何两个音完全相同,它们在舌位、唇形等方面都有所差异。就英汉口译中比较重要的语音差异而言,英语比汉语有着更细的单元音划分。比如,汉语中的扁唇前元音只有一个韵母 i,无论读得长一些、短一些,开口松一些还是紧一些,都表示同样的意思,没有词义上的变化。但是,英语中却有长元音 /iz/ 和短元音 /n/ 一对音素,二者会产生不同的意思,如 feet 和 fit,所以在听英语发音的时候要特别注意区分这种长短单元音的差别,从而更好地理解原文。

在辅音方面,汉语中没有浊辅音,只有清辅音;英语中则同时兼有发音部位和发音方法完全相同但清浊不同的辅音音素,如/s/—/z/,/f/—/v/。辅音所处的位置也不相同。汉语除了鼻韵母中的舌尖鼻辅音(通常称作"前鼻音")/n/和舌根鼻辅音(通常称作"后鼻音")/ng/可以后置以外,辅音一般都位于音节之前。英语中辅音的位置则很灵活。除了/h/和/r/等个别位置有所限制的辅音之外,其他的辅音都是既可位于音节前也可位于音节后,有的甚至可位于音节中。

就音渡而言,汉语中虽然有以韵母开始的音节,但都会在此之前用到声门闭塞音,而不是以真元音开始的,比如,棉袄 mián ǎo,不是 miánǎo(棉脑),天安门 tiān ān mén 不是 tiānán mén(天南门),所以汉语中没有连读。但英语中有很多的连读。一般来说,在同一个意群中,凡是以元音开始的音节,都可以与其前一音节的最后一个音素发生连读。所以在英汉口译的听辨训练中,要特别重视对连读的训练。本单元第一部分 Passage 3 中有比较明显的连读,请注意体会。

(2) 英语和汉语的语调差异

在语调上,英语和汉语之间存在很大的差异。汉语是声调语言,声调的 类型是词的一部分,决定了词的含义。不同的声调意味着不同的词。而英语 是语调语言,音高变化分布在短语和句子上(称为语调),而不是词上。英

语单词本身并没有固定的音高变化,而是根据其在句子中的位置获得音高变化。换句话说,语调在英语中是属于整个句子的,而不像汉语中的声调那样属于某个单词。在句子层面上,我们会发现,汉语句子的语调是在句中每个词的声调基础上通过抑扬顿挫形成的,而在英语语调中,起主要作用的是句子中的重读音节。句末的语调在汉语中只体现在句子最后一个字上,在英语中则一般体现在句子最后一个重读音节上。可结合本单元第一部分 Passage 1 和 Passage 2 进行体会。

(3) 英语和汉语的语流差异

在重音分布上,英语和汉语的差别很大。就单词的重音而言,汉语中组成词的每一个字(包括单字词)本身即具有重音,而英语中绝大多数的双音节词和多音节词都只有一个重音,虽然有些多音节词还有次重音,但次重音和重音绝不会紧挨在一起。就句子的重音而言,汉语中除了极个别的弱读音节外,句子重音几乎一个紧挨着一个。而在英语中,句子的重音很少挨在一起,大多数使用率很高的词,包括介词、连词、冠词、助动词等,一般都用弱读式。句中的重音往往正是句子的核心含义所在。

在音节的发音速度上,汉语属音节节拍语言,即无论说话速度的快慢,句子中的每个音节所占的时间大致相等。而英语则是重音节拍语言,即句子中的重读音节会有规律地出现,形成一定的节奏和韵律,由此,音节多的节奏组中的每个音节就会比音节少的节奏组中的每个音节要短,发音速度要快。相应地,如果能够体会和掌握到英语发言中的节奏,就会比较容易听懂发言的意思。请仔细体会本单元第一部分的 Passage 4 和 Passage 5。

三、口译主题练习

Listen to the following speeches and try to appreciate the features of the English language described in the above section.

Passage 1

Speech Scenario: In the following audio clip, a professor of Oxford University starts her lecture with a small case study on poverty alleviation.

d like to start with a little case study used in a Canadian training program several years ago. The case study was set in an Andean country where in the high mountain, altiplano people raised llamas and alpacas for their wool and skins. The university faculty worked hard to develop a treatment for the animals that would kill the insects that infested the wool and affected the quality of the wool and skin in the market.

So then, once they developed the treatment, they went to the rural villages, which were mainly inhabited by indigenous farmers. They called the men together and told them that they could improve the quality of the wool of the animals by making a bath of particular chemicals and bathing the animals, and in that way, they have better wool and they could make more money in the market. The men thanked the researchers from the university and said this was very useful, and then they went home to tell their wives about it, because in their society it was the wives who managed the llamas.

And the women took this very seriously because the men from the university had come to talk to their men, so after a long day of getting up before sunrise to prepare the breakfast, and then working in the fields, and grinding grain, and preparing dinner, after seeing to their husbands' needs and putting their children to bed, they made up the solution and they bathed their llamas—and the animals died, because after the sun sets in the Andes, it is very cold, too cold for animals to survive a late night bath. [1]

Passage 2

Speech Scenario: Ms. Sue Lawley, an anchorwoman of the BBC is introducing to the audience at the beginning of the 2008 Reith Lecture.

ello and welcome to the British Library in London. Sometimes called the "nation's memory", it houses millions of valuable items, including Magna Carta, Leonardo da Vinci's Notebook, and the National Sound Archive. It also houses the oldest book in the world, which was printed in 868 AD in China. This Chinese connection makes it an appropriate place in which to start this year's Reith Lectures. Our subject on this, their 60th anniversary, is China; and our lecturer, a man steeped in knowledge of this vast country, which of course in two months time plays host to the Olympic Games and is currently struggling to overcome the aftermath of a terrifying earthquake.

The title of the lectures is "Chinese Vistas". China's breathtaking economic growth over the last twenty-five years has transformed it into a great power. At the same time, for many people in the West its extraordinary past makes it an object of suspicion and mistrust. But there can be no doubt that it's a country which will have a significant influence over all of our lives in the years to come. In these lectures, we'll be exploring how it works and what makes it tick. Our guide is a man who knows China very well indeed. He's Sterling Professor of History at Yale University and is recognized as one of the foremost scholars of Chinese civilisation from the 16th century to the present day. "To understand China today," he says, "you have to understand its past."

In his first lecture, he's going back two and a half thousand years to Confucius, a man whose thoughts and ideas permeate the fabric of his country and make him still relevant to the China of today. The first lecture is called Confucian Ways. Ladies and Gentlemen, please welcome the 60th anniversary BBC Reith lecturer: Jonathan Spence. [2]

Passage 3

Speech scenario: Mr. Al Gore, former Vice President of the US, gives a speech as the 2007 Nobel Laureate.

our Majesties, Your Royal Highnesses, Honorable members of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have a purpose here today. It is a purpose I have tried to serve for many years. I have prayed that God would show me a way to accomplish it.

Sometimes, without warning, the future knocks on our door with a precious and painful vision of what might be. One hundred and nineteen years ago, a wealthy inventor read his own obituary, mistakenly published years before his death. Wrongly believing the inventor had just died, a newspaper printed a harsh judgment of his life's work, unfairly labeling him "The Merchant of Death" because of his invention—dynamite. Shaken by this condemnation, the inventor made a fateful choice to serve the cause of peace.

Seven years later, Alfred Nobel created this prize and the others that bear his name.

Seven years ago tomorrow, I read my own political obituary in a judgment that seemed to me harsh and mistaken—if not premature. But that unwelcome verdict

also brought a precious if painful gift: an opportunity to search for fresh new ways to serve my purpose.

Unexpectedly, that quest has brought me here. Even though I fear my words cannot match this moment, I pray that what I am feeling in my heart will be communicated clearly enough that those who hear me will say, "We must act."

The distinguished scientists with whom it is the greatest honor of my life to share this award have laid before us a choice between two different futures—a choice that to my ears echoes the words of an ancient prophet: "Life or death, blessings or curses. Therefore, choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."

We, the human species, are confronting a planetary emergency—a threat to the survival of our civilization that is gathering ominous and destructive potential even as we gather here. But there is hopeful news as well: we have the ability to solve this crisis and avoid the worst—though not all—of its consequences, if we act boldly, decisively and quickly.

However, despite a growing number of honorable exceptions, too many of the world's leaders are still best described in the words Winston Churchill applied to those who ignored Adolf Hitler's threat: "They go on in strange paradox, decided only to be undecided, resolved to be irresolute, adamant for drift, solid for fluidity, all powerful to be impotent."

So today, we dumped another 70 million tons of global-warming pollution into the thin shell of atmosphere surrounding our planet, as if it were an open sewer. And tomorrow, we will dump a slightly larger amount, with the cumulative concentrations now trapping more and more heat from the sun.

As a result, the earth has a fever. And the fever is rising. The experts have told us it is not a passing affliction that will heal by itself. We asked for a second opinion. And a third. And a fourth. And the consistent conclusion, restated with increasing distress, is that something basic is wrong.

We are what is wrong, and we must make it right.

Last September 21, as the Northern Hemisphere tilted away from the sun, scientists reported with unprecedented alarm that the North Polar ice cap is, in their words, "falling off a cliff". One study estimated that it could be completely gone during summer in less than 22 years. Another new study, to be presented by US Navy researchers later this week, warns it could happen in as little as seven years.

Seven years from now.

In the last few months, it has been harder and harder to misinterpret the signs that our world is spinning out of kilter. Major cities in North and South America, Asia and Australia are nearly out of water due to massive droughts and melting glaciers. Desperate farmers are losing their livelihoods. Peoples in the frozen Arctic and on low-lying Pacific islands are planning evacuations of places they have long called home. Unprecedented wildfires have forced a half million people from their homes in one country and caused a national emergency that almost brought down the government in another. Climate refugees have migrated into areas already inhabited by people with different cultures, religions, and traditions, increasing the potential for conflict. Stronger storms in the Atlantic and Pacific have threatened whole cities. Millions have been displaced by massive flooding in South Asia, Mexico, and 18 countries in Africa. As temperature extremes have increased, tens of thousands have lost their lives. We are recklessly burning and clearing our forests and driving more and more species into extinction. The very web of life on which we depend is being ripped and frayed.

We never intended to cause all this destruction, just as Alfred Nobel never intended that dynamite be used for waging war. He had hoped his invention would promote human progress. We shared that same worthy goal when we began burning massive quantities of coal, then oil and natural gas.

Even in Nobel's time, there were a few warnings of the likely consequences. One of the very first winners of the Prize in chemistry worried that, in his words, "We are evaporating our coal mines into the air." After performing 10,000 equations by hand, Svante Arrhenius calculated that the earth's average temperature would increase by many degrees if we doubled the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere.

Seventy years later, my teacher, Roger Revelle, and his colleague, Dave Keeling, began to precisely document the increasing CO₂ levels day by day.

But unlike most other forms of pollution, CO₂ is invisible, tasteless, and odorless—which has helped keep the truth about what it is doing to our climate out of sight and out of mind. Moreover, the catastrophe now threatening us is unprecedented—and we often confuse the unprecedented with the improbable.

We also find it hard to imagine making the massive changes that are now necessary to solve the crisis. And when large truths are genuinely inconvenient, whole Ц

societies can, at least for a time, ignore them. Yet as George Orwell reminds us: "Sooner or later a false belief bumps up against solid reality, usually on a battlefield."

In the years since this prize was first awarded, the entire relationship between humankind and the earth has been radically transformed. And still, we have remained largely oblivious to the impact of our cumulative actions.

Indeed, without realizing it, we have begun to wage war on the earth itself. Now, we and the earth's climate are locked in a relationship familiar to war planners: "Mutually assured destruction".

More than two decades ago, scientists calculated that nuclear war could throw so much debris and smoke into the air that it would block life-giving sunlight from our atmosphere, causing a "nuclear winter". Their eloquent warnings here in Oslo helped galvanize the world's resolve to halt the nuclear arms race.

Now science is warning us that if we do not quickly reduce the global warming pollution that is trapping so much of the heat our planet normally radiates back out of the atmosphere, we are in danger of creating a permanent "carbon summer".

As the American poet Robert Frost wrote, "Some say the world will end in fire; some say in ice." Either, he notes, "would suffice".

But neither need be our fate. It is time to make peace with the planet.

We must quickly mobilize our civilization with the urgency and resolve that has previously been seen only when nations mobilized for war. These prior struggles for survival were won when leaders found words at the 11th hour that released a mighty surge of courage, hope and readiness to sacrifice for a protracted and mortal struggle.

These were not comforting and misleading assurances that the threat was not real or imminent; that it would affect others but not ourselves; that ordinary life might be lived even in the presence of extraordinary threat; that Providence could be trusted to do for us what we would not do for ourselves.

No, these were calls to come to the defense of the common future. They were calls upon the courage, generosity and strength of entire peoples, citizens of every class and condition who were ready to stand against the threat once asked to do so. Our enemies in those times calculated that free people would not rise to the challenge; they were, of course, catastrophically wrong.

Now comes the threat of climate crisis—a threat that is real, rising, imminent,

and universal. Once again, it is the 11th hour. The penalties for ignoring this challenge are immense and growing, and at some near point would be unsustainable and unrecoverable. For now we still have the power to choose our fate, and the remaining question is only this: Have we the will to act vigorously and in time, or will we remain imprisoned by a dangerous illusion?

Mahatma Gandhi awakened the largest democracy on earth and forged a shared resolve with what he called "Satyagraha"—or "truth force".

In every land, the truth—once known—has the power to set us free.

Truth also has the power to unite us and bridge the distance between "me" and "we", creating the basis for common effort and shared responsibility.

There is an African proverb that says, "If you want to go quickly, go alone. If you want to go far, go together." We need to go far, quickly.

We must abandon the conceit that individual, isolated, private actions are the answer. They can and do help. But they will not take us far enough without collective action. At the same time, we must ensure that in mobilizing globally, we do not invite the establishment of ideological conformity and a new lock-step "ism".

That means adopting principles, values, laws, and treaties that release creativity and initiative at every level of society in multifold responses originating concurrently and spontaneously.

This new consciousness requires expanding the possibilities inherent in all humanity. The innovators who will devise a new way to harness the sun's energy for pennies or invent an engine that's carbon negative may live in Lagos or Mumbai or Montevideo. We must ensure that entrepreneurs and inventors everywhere on the globe have the chance to change the world.

When we unite for a moral purpose that is manifestly good and true, the spiritual energy unleashed can transform us. The generation that defeated fascism throughout the world in the 1940s found, in rising to meet their awesome challenge, that they had gained the moral authority and long-term vision to launch the Marshall Plan, the United Nations, and a new level of global cooperation and foresight that unified Europe and facilitated the emergence of democracy in Japan, Germany, Italy and much of the world. One of their visionary leaders said, "It is time we steered by the stars and not by the lights of every passing ship."

In the last year of that war, you gave the Peace Prize to a man from my hometown

of 2000 people, Carthage, Tennessee, in the USA. Cordell Hull was described by Franklin Roosevelt as the "Father of the United Nations". He was an inspiration and hero to my own father, who followed Hull in the Congress and the US Senate and in his commitment to world peace and global cooperation.

My parents spoke often of Hull, always in tones of reverence and admiration. Eight weeks ago, when you announced this prize, the deepest emotion I felt was when I saw the headline in my hometown paper that simply noted I had won the same prize that Cordell Hull had won. In that moment, I knew what my father and mother would have felt were they alive.

Just as Hull's generation found moral authority in rising to solve the world crisis caused by fascism, so can we find our greatest opportunity in rising to solve the climate crisis. In the Kanji characters used in both Chinese and Japanese, "crisis" is written with two symbols, the first meaning "danger", the second "opportunity". By facing and removing the danger of the climate crisis, we have the opportunity to gain the moral authority and vision to vastly increase our own capacity to solve other crises that have been too long ignored.

We must understand the connections between the climate crisis and the afflictions of poverty, hunger, HIV/AIDs and other pandemics. As these problems are linked, so too must be their solutions. We must begin by making the common rescue of the global environment the central organizing principle of the world community.

Fifteen years ago, I made that case at the "Earth Summit" in Rio de Janeiro. Ten years ago, I presented it in Kyoto. This week, I will urge the delegates in Bali to adopt a bold mandate for a treaty that establishes a universal global cap on emissions and uses the market in emissions trading to efficiently allocate resources to the most effective opportunities for speedy reductions.

This treaty should be ratified and brought into effect everywhere in the world by the beginning of 2010—two years sooner than presently contemplated. The pace of our response must be accelerated to match the accelerating pace of the crisis itself.

Heads of state should meet early next year to review what was accomplished in Bali and take personal responsibility for addressing this crisis. It is not unreasonable to ask, given the gravity of our circumstances, that these heads of state meet every three months until the treaty is completed.

We also need a moratorium on the construction of any new generating facility that burns coal without the capacity to safely trap and store carbon dioxide.

And most important of all, we need to put a *price* on carbon—with a CO₂ tax that is then rebated back to the people, progressively, according to the laws of each nation, in ways that shift the burden of taxation from employment to pollution. This is by far the most effective and simplest way to accelerate solutions to this crisis.

The world now needs an alliance—especially of those nations that weigh heaviest in the scales where earth is in the balance. I salute Europe and Japan for the steps they've taken in recent years to meet the challenge, and the new government in Australia, which has made solving the climate crisis its first priority.

But the outcome will be decisively influenced by two nations that are now failing to do enough: the United States and China. While India is also growing fast in importance, it should be absolutely clear that it is the two largest CO₂ emitters—most of all, my own country—that will need to make the boldest moves, or stand accountable before history for their failure to act.

Both countries should stop using the other's behavior as an excuse for stalemate and instead develop an agenda for mutual survival in a shared global environment.

These are the last few years of decision, but they can be the first years of a bright and hopeful future if we do what we must. No one should believe a solution will be found without effort, without cost, without change. Let us acknowledge that if we wish to redeem squandered time and speak again with moral authority, then these are the hard truths:

The way ahead is difficult. The outer boundary of what we currently believe is feasible is still far short of what we actually must do. Moreover, between here and there, across the unknown, falls the shadow.

That is just another way of saying that we have to expand the boundaries of what is possible. In the words of the Spanish poet, Antonio Machado, "Pathwalker, there is no path. You must make the path as you walk."

We are standing at the most fateful fork in that path. So I want to end as I began, with a vision of two futures—each a palpable possibility—and with a prayer that we will see with vivid clarity the necessity of choosing between those two futures, and the urgency of making the right choice now.

The great Norwegian playwright, Henrik Ibsen, wrote, "One of these days, the

younger generation will come knocking at my door."

The future is knocking at our door right now. Make no mistake, the next generation will ask us one of two questions. Either they will ask: "What were you thinking; why didn't you act?"

Or they will ask instead: "How did you find the moral courage to rise and successfully resolve a crisis that so many said was impossible to solve?"

We have everything we need to get started, save perhaps political will, but political will is a renewable resource.

So let us renew it, and let us say together: "We have a purpose. We are many. For this purpose we will rise, and we will act." [3]

练习难点提示

- [1] 本段发言语速较慢,发音清晰,句子中的重音节和弱音节区分明显,有比较明显的英语语言节奏。本发言叙述的是一个故事型的案例,聆听时请注意体会英语的语调和节奏,并可在头脑中想象出相应的场景,以完全把握发言的含义。
- [2] 本段发言语速较快,语流顺畅且包含的信息量较大,并有着非常明显的英式英语发音特点。聆听时请注意体会英式英语的发音和节奏。
- [3] 本段发言语速适中,是典型的美式英语演讲,其中包含演讲人 比较强烈的情感色彩。聆听时请注意体会美式英语的发音特点 和语流。

1