语用标记语：双边最佳交际

韩戈玲　著

东南大学出版社

PRAGMATIC MARKERS: TOWARD BI-DIRECTIONAL OPTIMALIZATION IN COMMUNICATION

语用标记语:双边最佳交际

韩戈玲 著

东南大学出版社
Southeast University Press
·南京·

内容提要

本书论述了会话语篇中语用标记语的性质和功能。作者构建了一个新的概念框架，旨在系统地描述语用标记语在言语交际中的普遍使用以及交际者如何运用语用标记语这一言语策略达到双边最佳交际。

本书适于语言专业研究生、高校教师研究参考使用。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语用标记语：双边最佳交际/韩戈玲著. —南京：东南大学出版社，2008.8

ISBN 978-7-5641-1036-9

Ⅰ. 语… Ⅱ. 韩… Ⅲ. 语用学 Ⅳ. H0

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2008)第 128489 号

东南大学出版社出版发行

(南京四牌楼 2 号 邮编 210096)

出版人：江 汉

江苏省新华书店经销 江苏兴化印刷有限公司印刷

开本：700mm×1000mm 1/16 印张：10 字数：196 千字

2008 年 9 月第 1 版 2008 年 9 月第 1 次印刷

书号：978-7-5641-1036-9/H·173

印数：1-2000 册 定价：18.00 元

(凡因印装质量问题，可与读者服务部联系调换。电话：025-83792328)

Acknowledgements

The book is an interdisciplinary investigation of pragmatic markers. It is not an isolated project accomplished all by myself, but many people have helped me during various stages of its writing. Their contributions cannot be measured or described in words.

First and foremost, I owe my greatest debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Professor He Zhaoxiong for his intellectual inspiration and illuminating guidance in the past years, and for his never-ending attention to my progress in the research and meticulous reading of the draft versions of every chapter separately. His remarkable insights, pertinent criticisms and helpful suggestions have contributed greatly to the improvement of the dissertation. Without his tremendous patience and reassuring encouragement, this work would not have been completed.

I would like to extend my hearty thanks to Professors Xu Yulong, Mei Deming, Feng Qinghua, Li Ji'an, Su Dingfang, Zhang Dingquan and Shi Zhikang for their enlightening and absorbing lectures from which I have benefited a lot.

I am grateful to Professor Bruce Fraser in School of Education, Boston University, and Dr Ran Yongping, Chu Xiuwei in Guangdong University of Foreign Studies for their online exchanges and attached references which have provided me with inspiring ideas.

Special thanks go to my friends and doctoral classmates for their personal contributions: Gong Weidong, Liao Qiaoyun, Liu Min, Xu Lijie, Yao Jun and Xiang Chengdong, to name just a few. And my particular thanks go to Cao Bo, Song Jianfu, Sun Yan, Wan Jiangbo, Wang Ruiyun and Wang Wenbin, who have been favouring me a great deal with their talented ideas.

I would like to thank my colleagues in University of Shanghai for Science and Technology: Professors Dai Weihua, Deng Zhiyong, He Gang, Lv Le, Lu Siyuan, Wang Bin, Associate Professors Liu Qin, Yang Tao and many others for their help in this or that respect.

My thanks also go to the authors of papers and books which are relevant to this study and which are quoted directly or indirectly.

Last but not least, I would express my heartfelt thanks to my family who have always been there. I am indebted to my grandma, my father, my mother, my sister and brother for their ever-lasting love. I would like to thank my husband Zhang Zhenxiang for his constant companionship, tolerance and unfailing support during these years. His endeavors have given me the peace and security which has made it possible for me to think and write. Throughout the writing of this work, he takes much work and responsibility for the family, and devotes special attention to our daughter Zhang Ningrui who has given new and important meanings to my life and often delights me with her witty words.

Despite the assistance of all the people referred to, I am solely responsible for all the misinterpretations and errors in this book. Any comment, suggestion or criticism will be highly appreciated.

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

Abstract

This book aims to explore the properties and multiple functions of pragmatic markers in interactive discourse, and it provides a conceptual framework for a consistent and systematic description of why pragmatic markers are predominant in oral interaction and how they serve to achieve bi-directional optimalization in interpersonal communication.

Based on theoretical ideas, research methodologies and findings of game theory, pragmatics and discourse analysis, the author proposes a conceptual framework with respect to the multi-dimensions of interpersonal communication: dynamic collaboration, interactive coherence and bilateral optimalization. The conceptual framework is assumed to be an underlying mechanism to account for the multifunctionality of pragmatic markers in interactive discourse.

The theoretical emphasis in this book is on the multi-facets of interpersonal communication and on the contributions of pragmatic markers as linguistic and contextual clues to meaning production and interpretation in interaction. In the dynamic process of communication, interlocutors usually make collaborative efforts to attain a balance between conflicts of interest on the multi-dimensions of interpersonal communication. And interlocutors often employ various pragmatic markers strategically or stylistically to attain the maximization of the final outcome. Owing to the uncertainty of verbal interaction, interlocutors often need to negotiate with each other so as to accurately decode the communicative messages intended by the other. As a result, pragmatic markers are often used to achieve interactive coherence in the online discourse which is composed of all the utterances of both the speaker and the hearer.

Assuming that pragmatics is to do with language use, the author focuses on the multifunctionality of pragmatic markers, which are elusive in meaning and ready for new senses or functions in interactive discourse. Noticing that not all aspects of the information conveyed by an utterance are equally accessible and not all aspects of language use involve computations of equal complexity, we assume that pragmatic markers contribute to the overall meaning conveyed by the utterances in which they occur. Specifically, pragmatic markers function as clues

to explicatures and implicatures conveyed by utterances, and have both conceptual meaning and procedural meaning. As people rarely encode exactly in a univocal linguistic form the messages they intend to communicate, it is crucial for interlocutors to decode and infer both the explicit and implicit information conveyed in their utterances. Pragmatic markers often facilitate the expression and interpretation of utterance meanings, and help the interlocutors to identify both the propositional meanings of an utterance and the communicative attitude of the speaker.

With data from actual conversations and media talks, the author makes a detailed analysis of the multiple functions of pragmatic markers. The result of the study confirms the assumption that the use and functions of pragmatic markers are closely related to the multiple goals on different discoursal levels in interpersonal communication. Pragmatic markers serve to achieve discourse coherence, organize information, enhance interpersonal relationship and index communicative strategies as well. The meanings and functions of pragmatic markers are constrained by the contextual factors involved in communicative situations.

Key words: pragmatic marker; utterance interpretation; pragmatic constraints; discourse coherence; bilateral optimization

内容简介

本书论述了会话语篇中语用标记语的性质和功能。作者构建了一个新的概念框架，旨在系统地描述语用标记语在言语交际中的普遍使用以及交际者如何运用语用标记语这一言语策略达到双边最佳交际。

在综合博弈论、语用学和语篇分析等理论的重要概念、研究方法和成果的基础上，作者提出了一个三维概念框架：动态合作、交互连贯、双边最佳交际以阐释语用标记语的多功能性及其运作机制。

本书的理论核心在于人类交际活动的多面性和语用标记语对话语意义表达和阐释的语境制约。鉴于言语交际的不确定性和动态性，交际双方在交际过程中必须及时调整交际策略，包括语言策略，以便正确识别彼此的交际意图。实际上，交际双方通常相互配合、共同努力以取得有利于各自的最佳交际效果。我们认为最佳交际效果是一个交际目标多元化的平衡体。语用标记语作为交际策略或修辞手段在言语交际中十分常见，并且有助于会话语篇中话语的交互连贯。

语用学主要研究语言的使用，作者从语用学角度论述了语用标记语的意义不确定性及其在具体交际语境中的多重功能。我们认为交际中话语所表达的信息是多层次的，因而对话语意义的理解不是一个简单的信息解码过程，而是涉及逻辑推理和语境作用的一个比较复杂的过程。说话人常常借助于语用标记语直接或间接表明其意图；听话人则借助于语用标记语快速明白话语的多层意义并予以得体的应答。研究还表明，不论是叙述还是论证，交际者都会使用语用标记语表明自己的意图和态度。总之，语用标记语不仅是话语显意和会话含义的标记符，而且同时具有概念性和程序性制约功能。

本书的语料主要选自日常会话以及英语和汉语的媒体访谈节目。因为在电视、广播访谈节目中主持人和嘉宾的角色相对固定，有利于定量和定性分析会话中语用标记语的特征和功能。作者通过例证分析表明语用标记语的功能多样性和交际目标的多面性密切相关。语用标记语有助于语篇连贯和组织，有利于改善人际关系以及调整交际策略。语用标记语的功能和作用受制于交际中不同语境因素的制约。

关键词：语用标记语，话语理解，语用制约，语篇连贯，双边最佳交际

* 本书由上海市教委科研项目[06ES040]资助出版。

序

语用学到底研究什么？这个问题在语用学产生至三十年后的今天似乎还常常会引发一些不同的意见和看法。在我看来，语用学所研究的并非是什么新的东西，而是人们再熟悉不过的语言和再普通不过的语言交际现象。语言和语言交际中的许多现象早已引起了人们的注意并且已经有人做过各种研究。但语用学则是从一个和以往不同的、几乎是全新的角度去对一些我们已知的现象做出新的审视，得出新的结论，从而加深我们对语言和语言交际的认识。本专著所关注的“语用标记语”便是这些现象之一。

“语用标记语”这个术语所涵盖的词项有许多，这些词项被不同的研究者冠以不同的名称，在不同的领域，从不同的角度做了不同的研究。近年来，随着对语用研究的热情日益高涨，把这些标记语冠以“语用标记语”的新名称，纳入到语用研究范畴的实例日益见多。韩戈玲博士所做的这一研究便是其一。本研究和先前的同类研究具有明显的共性，即都以探讨语用标记语的性质和功能为主旨，但同时它又具有自己明显的特性。本研究最主要的特点是它不拘泥于对个别的语用标记语做表面的个案研究，而是提出了一个新的、具有覆盖性的理论框架，将语用标记语纳入到该框架下，对它们的性质和功能进行全面的研究，以求得出一些具有共性的结论。韩博士在综合博弈论、语用学和语篇分析等理论的重要概念、研究方法和成果的基础上，提出了一个三维概念框架：动态合作、交互连贯、双边最佳交际，并将其运用于系统地描述语用标记语在语言交际中的使用以及交际者如何运用语用标记语这一言语策略达到双边最佳交际。我认为该框架的提出具有很大的创新性，尤其是把博弈论这一似乎不属于语言研究范畴的理论引入到该研究中来。第一次听到韩博士的这一想法时，我实感意外，但她其后的工作和结果都证明了她的这一想法是有充分根据的；她本人对该框架的运用也是相当成功的，证明了该框架的可行性和应用价值。

一个研究的价值不仅仅在于它本身发现或证明了什么，更重要的或许应该是看该研究能否为他人今后还要进行的研究提供启示，指点方向。韩戈玲博士所做的这一研究恰恰体现了这一层价值。毫无疑问，它对以后的语用标记语的研究具有指导意义和参考价值。

本专著体现了韩戈玲博士在语用学研究方面的功底和她的科研能力。据我所知，本专著是韩博士第一本公开出版的学术著作。我在此对她表示祝贺，同时又预祝她有更多的力作问世。

何兆熊

2008 年 1 月

A List of Abbreviations and Symbols

EFL: English as Foreign Language
ESL: English as Second Language
FTA: face threatening act
L2: Second language
PM: pragmatic marker
PMs: pragmatic markers
-: a break in utterance
...: a delay in utterance
[ ]: unpronounced item

A List of Tables and Figures

Table 4. 1 Taxonomies of pragmatic markers
Table 4. 2 Distinctions between layers of meanings conveyed by an utterance
Fig. 6. 1 Median rates (per 1,000 words) of use of pragmatic markers in interviews and conversations
Fig. 6. 2 Median rates (per 1,000 words) of use of pragmatic markers

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ..... Ⅶ
Abstract ..... Ⅸ
内容简介 ..... Ⅺ
序 ..... Ⅻ
A List of Abbreviations and Symbols ..... ⅩⅣ
A List of Tables and Figures ..... ⅩⅤ
Chapter One Introduction 1
Preliminary Remarks 1
1.1 Broad Preview 1
1.2 Remaining Issues in Previous Studies 3
1.3 Rationale of the Present Research 4
1.4 Objective of the Current Study 6
1.5 Description of the Target Data 8
1.6 The Organization of the Book 8
Chapter Two Literature Review 10
2.1 Diversified Terminology 10
2.2 Various Perspectives on Pragmatic Markers 12
2.2.1 Pragmatic Markers and Logic-syntactic Structure 12
2.2.2 Pragmatic Markers and Discourse Coherence 15
2.2.3 Pragmatic Markers and Relevance Theory 18
2.2.4 Pragmatic Markers from a Pragmatic Perspective 22
2.3 Summary 24
Chapter Three Theoretical Framework 26
3.1 Theoretical Grounds for the Research Approach 26
3.1.1 Game Theory and the Application of Its Ideas 27
3.1.2 Pragmatic Studies on Implicature 35

3.1.3 Discourse Analysis and the Main Issues 39
3.2 Description of the Conceptual Framework 40
3.2.1 Dynamic Collaboration 41
3.2.2 Interactive Coherence 44
3.2.3 Bilateral Optimalization 46
3.3 Summary 48
Chapter Four Properties of Pragmatic Markers 50
4.1 Identification of Pragmatic Markers 50
4.1.1 Previous Definitions of Pragmatic Markers 50
4.1.2 Operational Definition of Pragmatic Markers 52
4.2 Distinctive Features of Pragmatic Markers 55
4.3 Taxonomies of Pragmatic Markers 57
4.3.1 Interaction Initiating Markers 58
4.3.2 Sequential Markers 60
4.3.3 Attitudinal Markers 63
4.3.4 Illocutionary Force Markers 65
4.3.5 Tactic Markers 66
4.3.6 Information Intensifying Markers 69
4.3.7 Interim Summary 70
4.4 Interpretative Orientation of Pragmatic Markers 70
4.5 Pragmatic Markers and Inference of Explicatures and Implicatures 75
4.5.1 Distinction of the Explicit/Implicit, Explicature/Implicature 75
4.5.2 Conceptual and Procedural Meanings of Pragmatic Markers ... 78
4.5.3 Pragmatic Markers and Constraints on Implicature 81
4.6 Summary 83
Chapter Five Pragmatic Markers in Interactive Discourse 84
5.1 Pragmatic Markers as Devices of Discourse Coherence in Interaction 84
5.1.1 Pragmatic Markers Signaling Conversational Development 84

5. 1. 2 Pragmatic Markers Functioning as Information Management Devices 86
5. 1. 3 Pragmatic Markers Highlighting Interpersonal Relationship 89
5. 1. 4 Pragmatic Markers Conveying Communicative Attitude 91
5. 2 Multifunctionality of Pragmatic Markers 93
5. 3 Distribution of Pragmatic Markers in Argumentative Discourse 96
5. 4 Summary 99
Chapter Six Factors Influencing the Use of Pragmatic Markers 100
6. 1 Social Variables 100
6. 1. 1 Interaction Situation 101
6. 1. 2 Speaker Role 105
6. 1. 3 Speech Community 107
6. 2 Speech Genre 110
6. 3 Cultural Values 112
6. 4 Summary 113
Chapter Seven Conclusion 115
7. 1 Summary of the Major Findings 115
7. 1. 1 Findings Relating to the Dynamic Process of Verbal Interaction 115
7. 1. 2 Findings Concerning Pragmatic Markers in Interactive Discourse 116
7. 2 Implications and Applications 117
7. 3 Limitations of the Present Study 119
7. 4 Suggestions for Further Research 120
Appendix 1 122
Appendix 2 123
BIBLIOGRAPHY 124

Chapter One Introduction

Preliminary Remarks

Broadly speaking, the term **pragmatic marker** covers a wide range of expressive means used as functional clues to the manifestation and interpretation of the speaker's communicative intentions. It refers to linguistic, paralinguistic, or non-verbal elements that signal the speaker's communicative messages as well as his communicative attitudes. The pragmatic markers examined in the present study are primarily expressions capable of being morphologically represented, such as sentential conjunctions, parenthetical adverbials, fillers, interjections. Nonetheless, it is unnecessary to separate these morphological items from the acoustic concomitants. An understanding of pragmatic markers will be more complete with a combinatory analysis of the prosody of interactive discourse. In this book pragmatic markers are limited to items with morphological forms for the sake of convenience. As for examples of pragmatic markers in the present study, we choose those items found in both Chinese and English interactive discourse, assuming that the two languages have something in common in this respect and therefore the findings can apply to them both at least.

1.1 Broad Preview

The last 30 years has witnessed a booming study on pragmatic markers in the field of linguistics, pragmatics and allied fields as well. Pragmatic markers—expressions like *oh*, *well*, *and*, *but*, *so*, *ok*, *y'know*, *I mean*, *innit* abound in segments of verbal communication. These expressions are grouped together functionally and are usually thought not to "affect the propositional content of utterances in which they occur" (Schourup 1999: 227). They have been approached from various perspectives and within different frameworks relating to divergent goals of research. Generally speaking, growing interest revolves around the multi-functions of pragmatic markers in speech and writing. Some researches deal with the whole range of pragmatic markers, while most others focus on individual items; some studies examine the data from written literature

in a language, while more recent studies center upon recorded data of conversations in media and actual interactions. As a matter of fact, the expanding study of pragmatic markers has turned into a "growth industry in linguistics" (Fraser, 1998a: 301; 1999: 932).

Despite the widening scope of interest, researchers have not come to an agreement upon the definition of the term "pragmatic marker". In fact, the problem lies not only with consistence of the term, but also with difficulty in knowing whether these different terms are delineating the same set of phenomena. A careful investigation will reveal the discrepancies between different labels. For example, Schiffrin(1987: 31) defines discourse markers as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk", such items are found in her rough list of analysis: *oh*, *well*, *and*, *but*, *or*, *so*, *because*, *now*, *then*, *I mean*, *y'know*, *anyway*, *however*. Blakemore uses the term "discourse marker"(2002) and "discourse connective"(1987, 1992) to refer to expressions which "impose constraints on relevance in virtue of inferential connections they express"(1987: 147), or "in other words, constraints on the result of the pragmatic inferences involved in the recovery of implicit content"(2002: 4), which "must be broadened to include constraints on all aspects of inferential processing". She claims, "If the term 'discourse markers' does indeed refer to a particular class of expressions, then they must have a property which distinguishes them from other discourse operators. This property is generally considered to be their function of marking relationships or connections among units of discourse"(2002: 2). She has discussed such markers respectively as *and*, *after all*, *although*, *you see*, *but*, *nevertheless*, *however*, *moreover*, *furthermore*, *so*, *well*. Andersen (1998, 2000, 2001: 39) uses the term "pragmatic marker" to "describe a class of short, recurrent linguistic items that generally have little lexical import but serve significant pragmatic functions in conversation", such as *well*, *so*, *but*, *after all*, *yeah*, *innit*. Fraser (1990, 1996) regards discourse markers as a subtype of pragmatic markers—"linguistically encoded clues which signal the speaker's potential communicative intentions"(1996: 168). The following items are on his long list of discourse markers:

above all, accordingly, after all, alright, also, alternatively, although, and, anyhow, anyway, as a result, because, besides, better, but, by the way, consequently, conversely, despite, however, in other words,

indeed, moreover, now, ok, say, so, then, well, you see... (**Fraser** 1990: 387)

Although the descriptions of the term are not consistent, it is agreed that the function of pragmatic markers is of utterance rather than of sentence, and their role should be analyzed at discoursal level rather than sentential level. More importantly, pragmatic markers occur at different places in the discourse and give important clues to how discourse is segmented and processed. This means that they are crucial to utterance interpretation in interpersonal communication.

Among all the researches on pragmatic markers, the most fruitful ones are within the frameworks of logic-syntactic analysis, discourse analysis, relevance theory and pragmatic theory. The studies have focused on the properties and functions of pragmatic markers as a whole or as individual markers in different languages. Most of the studies concern the constraints imposed by pragmatic markers on the discourse structure of conversations as well as on the explicature and implicature of utterances. Up to now, the study of pragmatic markers has provided useful analysis at the interface of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. However, most analyses of pragmatic markers with linguistic data of recorded daily conversations appear to be localized and unsystematic. Therefore, a more global and systematic study is needed. The present study attempts to probe into the motivation to utilize pragmatic markers in interactive discourse, especially into the contributions of PMs to the expression of the speaker's communicative intentions and to the hearer's comprehension of the explicit and implicit messages in oral interaction.

1.2 Remaining Issues in Previous Studies

Discrepancies in the descriptions of pragmatic markers mentioned above reveal that unsolved problems still remain in the existing studies. Some of the pressing problems will be briefly introduced in this section.

First of all, disagreement on the definition and the range of pragmatic markers results in diversified terminology, which causes the definition to be a prominent issue for researchers working on pragmatic markers. Therefore, criteria are needed to describe the characteristics of PMs and to decide whether a given instance is a PM.

Secondly, a review of different approaches to pragmatic markers displays

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com