

A Review of Language Landscape Studies at Home and Abroad

Guojiang Qi, Ping Yin

College of Foreign Languages, Heihe University; Heihe, Heilongjiang, 164300, China

Keywords: Domestic and Foreign; Language Landscape; Review

Abstract: Language landscape is one of the hot topics in sociolinguistics. More and more scholars have paid attention to it and achieved fruitful results. This paper reviews the studies of language landscape at home and abroad. The study of language landscape in China is mainly reviewed from the perspectives of linguistic research emphasis, significant research on multilingualism, and comparison of language landscape between English/Russian and Chinese. Foreign language landscape studies are mainly reviewed from a wide range of perspectives, prominent language landscape perspectives, cultural perspectives and pragmatic perspectives. The research in this paper provides Chinese scholars with an overall understanding of the study of language landscape at home and abroad, and is also conducive to the further development of the study of language landscape.

1. A Review of Domestic Language Landscape Studies

The study of language landscape in China began in 1989 and flourished in the 21st century. Most of the documents appeared as “public signs”, while 282 articles were titled as “language landscape”, mainly non-empirical studies. With a wide range of research fields, most of the signs are chosen in urban commercial areas and tourist attractions. This paper analyses the quality of the English translation of Chinese-English bilingual public signs with examples, and puts forward translation strategies and normative suggestions.

Using social cognition, SPEAKING model, language selection theory, translation theory, geography theory, semiotics, spatial dimension of language landscape, intertextuality, corpus, etc., analyze the English translation errors of a language landscape and its causes Correct it.

2. Linguistic Research Focuses on

2.1 Research on Basic Problems

The concept, function and research content of language landscape are discussed. The concepts of language landscape and public signs are not perfect yet. Information and symbolic functions are the most basic functions of language landscape (Shang Guowen, Zhao Shouhui 2014); This paper examines the linguistic features (orthography, vocabulary, syntax, etc.) on the signs, and the interaction between the linguistic landscape and the power and status of the group.

This paper introduces the methodology of language landscape research (object of study, corpus classification, corpus processing and analysis). Language landscape has the same research object as public signs, but the former focuses on Sociology while the latter focuses on translatology. There are many names in the relevant studies, which are basically unified as “public signs”. Signs are classified into various categories, and can be divided into official and unofficial signs according to subjectivity. The corpus can be processed according to labels, i.e. according to genre, location, location, field, context, specific place, carrier, etc. The analysis method is quantitative or qualitative. This paper discusses the epistemological basis, analytical dimension and theoretical construction of language landscape research (Shang Guowen, Zhao Shouhui 2014).

2.2 Sign Language Form Features

Public signs have the characteristics of conciseness and precision. In vocabulary, nouns, noun phrases, gerunds and abbreviations are frequently used. Grammatically, the sentence patterns are mainly imperative sentences and ellipsis sentences, without explicit cohesive devices, and tenses are

mostly present tense. Arrangement and writing, combination of words and signs, common capital letters in English and Russian. The unofficial sign language is more complex and diverse. Language signs in multi-lingual areas are characterized by code mixing and text substitution.

3. Significant research on Multilingualism

3.1 The Power and Position of Language

Comparing the similarities and differences of multilingual landscapes between the concentrated and non-concentrated areas, the central city and the suburbs, and the minority areas, it is found that Macao's Chinese takes precedence over English, English takes precedence over Portuguese, and the minority languages are at the most disadvantage (Zhang Yuanyuan, Zhang Binhu 2016); Chinese is the strongest language in the Beijing-Shanghai Korean diaspora, Korean dominates in some areas, and English is more of an auxiliary language (Yu Weiqi et al. 2016). The Chinese inhabited by the African immigrants in Guangzhou is absolutely dominant. English is the preferred foreign language for sign language, followed by Arabic, and the weakest position in both French and Uighur (Wu Xili, Zhanju 2017); Pure of Shanghai Yuyuan Mall and Laojie Chinese Simplified has the largest proportion, followed by Chinese-English mixed writing, and Chinese traditional Chinese is used more frequently in Shanghai Old Street (Deng Xiao Fei 2015). The code status relationship in minority areas is more complicated: Chinese maintains the position of the strongest code, English has no obvious code advantage, the information function of minority languages is weaker, but it is widely used as cultural and commercial symbols (Nie Peng, Mu Nai Re Ha 2017; Xu Honggang, Yan Ren 2015; Li Lisheng, Xia Na 2017).

In view of this, the multilingual phenomenon of language landscape in modern cities is remarkable. The population structure, internationalization level, regional positioning, language policy orientation and other factors in the study area have affected the final presentation form of language landscape to varying degrees.

3.2 Dissemination of English

English communication (problems) are all involved, but there is little in-depth analysis of its performance characteristics and influence. With the advancement of globalization, various signs in urban commercial areas, tourist areas and areas inhabited by foreign immigrants. As a neutral language, the function of English has been enhanced, and its influence on the native language has gradually infiltrated into orthographic, lexical and syntactic levels.

3.3 Language Differences between Official and Unofficial Signs

There are differences between official signs and unofficial signs in the use frequency and prominence of loanwords, regional common languages and minority languages. The multilingual degree of unofficial signs is higher than that of official signs (Zhang Yuanyuan, Zhang Binhu 2016; Qiu Ying 2016). The reason is that the official language policy has a direct impact on the language use of official signs; the language landscape of unofficial signs is influenced by multiple factors such as the number of people using language, identity culture, and the economic value of language, and its construction mechanism is more complicated.

4. English/Russian-Chinese Contrast of Language Landscape

4.1 Comparison of English and Chinese Language Landscape

Lexically, both English and Chinese use nouns and noun phrases. English idiomatic gerunds, adjectives and prepositional phrases; Verbs are often used in Chinese. Euphemism is used in English and forbidden language is used in Chinese. Grammatically, English and Chinese use a large number of short sentences, elliptical sentences and imperative sentences (Liu Qi 2011). English word order has its consequences before its causes, while Chinese word order has its consequences before its causes. Rhetorically, English is humorous and Chinese is good at parallelism, duality and

rhyme (Dong Lirong 2013).

4.2 A Contrast between Russian and Chinese Language Landscapes

In terms of vocabulary, both Russian and Chinese forbid the use of uncommon words, using cultural background words, borrowing foreign words, using commendatory words, euphemisms, network words, preferring large fonts and color fonts. Chinese uses rhyme words and Russian uses pronunciation words. In terms of morphology, Russian and Chinese nouns and verbs are frequently used, highlighting Keywords. Gerunds, adverbs and adverbs are also found in Russian. Syntactically, Russian and Chinese commonly use centring phrases and appositive phrases, with little or no use of juxtaposed phrases. Chinese seldom use “adjective+noun” centring phrases, while “noun+noun” centring phrases are commonly used. In Russian, the two types of centring phrases are used in the same frequency, with no significant difference (Jiao Min 2013). Chinese uses the nouns of the proper names of “proper nouns + common nouns” and “general nouns + proper nouns”; Russian only uses the “common nouns + proper nouns” class homomorphic structure. Russian and Chinese commonly used simple sentences such as imperative sentences and interrogative sentences, and they are used in current or non-current forms. Russian also uses infinitive sentences; Chinese used active sentences, Russian also commonly used passive sentences; Chinese word order is relatively fixed, Russian word order is relatively random.

5. A Review of Foreign Language Landscape Studies

5.1 Wide Scope and Diverse Perspectives

Western language landscape research began in the 1970s. The study of “language landscape” from the perspective of sociolinguistics is based on the paper “Language Landscape and National Language Vitality: An Empirical Study” published by Landry & Bourhis in 1997. In 2015, John Benjamins, a Dutch publishing group, launched the International Journal of Language Landscape, which marked the maturity of the research on language landscape. The research focuses on the use of multilingualism, the implementation of language policies, the use of regional or minority languages, and the spread and spread of English. Russia only studies the linguistic landscape from the linguistic point of view, starting late, and has seen little literature. At present, there is no consensus on the names of linguistic landscapes, which are expressed in a variety of ways.

Using the theoretical framework of language landscapes such as sociolinguistics, linguistic ecology, sociology, semiotics, geography, and culture, the theoretical interpretation of language landscape is increasingly multidisciplinary.

5.2 The Perspective of Language Landscape

5.2.1 Use of multiple Languages

Ben-Rafael(2006) conducted a survey and analysis of the patterns of the Hebrew, Arabic and English language landscapes in the Jewish community in Israel, the Palestinian community and the non-Israeli-Palestinian community in East Jerusalem, and found that the languages of different ethnic communities have different language landscape patterns. Huebner (2006) analyzed Thai, English and Chinese in 15 Community streets in central and suburban Bangkok from the perspectives of language contact, language mixing and language advantages. It was found that Chinese signs have gradually turned to English signs, and English has become the most important language besides Thai. Backhouse(2006)The linguistic landscaping signs used in 28 stations along the Yamamoto subway in Tokyo, Japan were investigated. It was found that English and Japanese landmarks accounted for a large proportion, while multilingual landmarks (11 languages such as Chinese, Korean, French, Spanish) accounted for a small proportion.

5.2.2 Implementation of Language Policy

Backhouse(2009) compared the language regulations or related regulations of Quebec in Canada

and Tokyo in Japan. Quebec government stipulates that French must be used in public space, while Tokyo government encourages the use of English and other foreign languages. Lado (2011) compares the public and private language landscape of two cities in Valencia, Spain, and points out that there are inconsistencies or even conflicts between the official language policy and the actual language used.

5.2.3 The Use of Regional or Minority Languages

Genoz and Gorter(2006) compared the language landscapes on the two streets of Basque and Frisian cities where Spain and Holland use regional ethnic languages, and found that Basque language is more common in the language landscapes of Basque region, only lower than Spanish. However, the proportion of English used in the language landscape in Frisians is second. The use of Frisian is in third place. The root cause of the difference is that the Basque language is protected by local language policy; Coluzzi (2009) surveys the language landscapes of Milan and Udi in Italy, with a focus on the region. The use of sexual and minority languages indicates that the use of regional or minority languages in Italian language landscapes is extremely rare, and the use of English is more common.

5.2.4 The Spread and Spread of English

Kasanga(2012) analyzed the language landscape distribution pattern of a business district in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, and found that the official Khmer language occupies an absolute number, followed by English, which has gradually replaced French, reflecting the increasingly obvious influence of English in economic activities brought about by globalization. Lai (2012) analyzed the samples collected in four selected regions of Hong Kong and found that the proportion of Chinese and English bilinguals is close, but the use of simplified Chinese characters in language landscape is not common; in typical English as a foreign language, English is in Seoul. Use in landscapes such as streets and parks is also common (Lawrence 2012).

5.2.5 A Study of Cultural Perspective

А. Вежбицкая (2001) comparatively analyzes the “prohibited” language landscapes in Germany and the United States from a cultural perspective, and defines the language landscape more authoritatively. The language landscape is named общественные знаки, which is used by most Russian scholars; С. Г. Тер-Минасова (2000) in the “Language and Intercultural Communication” chapter “Cultural Crossroads and Crossroads Culture” explores Russian and English information - vocabulary means of regulating texts, as well as notices and calls in English and Russian Cultural characteristics of the world; Е. А. Покровская et al. (2011) introduced a chapter in the monograph “Speech Genre in Cultural Dialogue” to introduce the classification and function of the “instruction-prohibition” language landscape. From the perspective of form and grammar, Russia, Italy, and In the English language, the verbal genre of the “instruction-prohibition” language landscape believes that the “instruction-prohibition” language landscape genre has diversity, and the language landscape is moderate in meaning and English, but more resolute in Russian culture. Д. И. Медведева(2004,2005)From the perspective of language and culture, this paper makes a comparative analysis of the expression means of the “forbidden” meaning language landscape in Russian, English and German and the characteristics of the warning language landscape in the field of commerce and trade. His associate doctoral thesis “Language Interpretation of the” forbidden “concept in the language landscape” (2008) regards the language landscape as the style of official documents, analyzes the language characteristics and expression means of the “forbidden” language landscape in Germany and Russia, and discusses the language and cultural characteristics of the “forbidden” concept in Germany and Russia. She (2005) also analyzed the non-equivalent language landscape reflecting Russian cultural norms, and (2005) discussed the teaching method of using language landscape to compare national conditions.

5.2.6 A Pragmatic Perspective

Б. М. Ариштейн(2001)From the perspective of pragmatics, this paper discusses the language

features of language landscape. Л.В.Шорина (2007) Doctoral Paper “Language Landscape and Its Position in Speech Act System - Taking English and Russian as Examples”, from the perspective of communicative pragmatics and national social pragmatics, this paper makes a comparative analysis of speech acts and national socio-cultural characteristics in English and Russian language landscape, and reveals the structure-syntax and semantic features of English and Russian language landscape. Point and its relationship with politeness category; E. B. Астапенко(2004)Analysis of English “forbidden” language landscape; T. B. Русснова(2006)discusses the functional characteristics of Russian and English “forbidden” language landscapes. Ю. С. Буренина's (2011)doctoral thesis “Information - Adjusting the Form and Function of Text - Taking French as an Example” explores French information - the vocabulary-grammatical expression of imperative modality in texts, revealing information by imposing modal expression strategies - regulating text Pragmatic features.

6. Brief Comment

Domestic research started late, and the theoretical perspective has the characteristics of interdisciplinary diversification. However, the overall theoretical foundation is weak. It mainly analyzes the language landscape errors, errors and English translation strategies in a certain area and corrects them, and conducts less theoretical discussions. The focus of research has shifted from the translation perspective to the sociolinguistic perspective, but most of them are scattered studies, mainly Chinese-English translation, with little comparative study of Russian and bilingual, and no extraction of language landscape model. Using the methods of investigation, observation, exemplification and occasional corpus.

The study of language landscape in Russian-speaking countries abroad lags behind that in China, and scholars pay little attention to the concept and theoretical system of language landscape. Based on the linguistic data of Russian, English and German language landscapes, this study mainly analyses the linguistic and functional characteristics of “prohibited” language landscapes from the perspective of culture and speech act theory. There is no literature on the translation of Chinese and Russian language landscapes, and no corpus method is found by using the methods of investigation and observation. Therefore, domestic language landscape research needs to strengthen the introduction and critical reference of foreign theoretical systems and research trends. Pay attention to the empirical research combining qualitative and quantitative research; Strengthen comparative and cross-cutting research, refine language landscape language and translation mode.

Acknowledgement

This article is one of the achievements of 2018 Philosophy and Social Science Research Project of Heilongjiang Province-”A Study on the Modeling of Russian Translation of Chinese Linguistic Landscape Against the Background of the Belt and Road Initiative” (18YYE695).

References

- [1] Li Lisheng. Review of Foreign Language Landscape Studies and Its Implications [J]. Journal of beijing international studies university, 2015(4).
 - [2] Shang Guowen, Zhao Shouhui. Analytical Dimension and Theoretical Construction of Language Landscape [J]. Foreign Languages, 2014(6).
 - [3] Shang Guowen, Zhao Shouhui. Perspectives, Theories and Methods of Language Landscape Research [J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 2014(2).
- Wu xili, zhanju, Liu xiaobo. theoretical perspective, problem orientation and research methods of language landscape research [J]. academic research, 2017(7).