高等英语教育出版分社宗旨：
推动科研·服务教学·坚持创新
外研社·高等英语教育出版分社
FLTRP Higher English Education Publishing
电话：010-88819595
传真：010-88819400
E-mail：ced@fltrp.com
网址：http://www.heep.cn
（教育网 http://edu.heep.cn）

一个学术性教育性
出版机构
网址：http://www.fltrp.com

批评性语篇分析的修辞维度研究

Study in the Rhetorical Dimension of Critical Discourse Analysis

李艳芳　著

外语教学与研究出版社
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS
北京 BEIJING

图书在版编目（CIP）数据

批评性语篇分析的修辞维度研究＝Study in the Rhetorical Dimension of Critical Discourse Analysis：英文/李艳芳著．— 北京：外语教学与研究出版社，2011.8

ISBN 978-7-5135-1152-0

Ⅰ．①批… Ⅱ．①李… Ⅲ．①英语—修辞学—研究—英文 Ⅳ．①H315

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字（2011）第172273号

出 版 人：蔡剑峰
责任编辑：程 序
封面设计：覃一彪
版式设计：付玉梅
出版发行：外语教学与研究出版社
社　　址：北京市西三环北路19号（100089）
网　　址：http://www.fltrp.com
印　　刷：北京传奇佳彩数码印刷有限公司
开　　本：650×980　1/16
印　　张：13.25
版　　次：2011年8月第1版　2012年3月第3次印刷
书　　号：ISBN 978-7-5135-1152-0
定　　价：47.90元

*　　*　　*

购书咨询：(010)88819929　　电子邮箱：club@fltrp.com
如有印刷、装订质量问题，请与出版社联系
联系电话：(010)61207896　　电子邮箱：zhijian@fltrp.com
制售盗版必究 举报查实奖励
版权保护办公室举报电话：(010)88817519
物料号：211520001

前言

20 世纪 80 年代西方人文社会科学的修辞学转向引发了对科学主义的批判以及对真理、现实、主客体关系等的再认识。这种批判较之哲学和社会科学研究中的语言学转向所引发的批判更系统、更深入、更具有冲击力。批评性语篇分析（CDA）的兴起在很大程度上正是对这一转向的积极回应。通过对作为构成社会结构的社会实践——语篇的解构，CDA 探索语篇和社会文化形态之间隐藏的权势关系，从而揭露语篇中的不平等、意识形态、歧视和偏见等。CDA 建立的前提是语言学分析能够为现有的社会批判方法提供独特的视角。经过过去二三十年的发展，CDA 逐渐确立了自身学科的社会参与度和关联性，从而提高了自身的学术地位。

尽管 CDA 的理论和方法在逐步完善，但是 CDA 仍然面临着一些亟待解决的问题，不解决好这些问题将会在很大程度上阻碍其进一步发展：第一，尽管 CDA 赋予批评以新的内涵以示自身同以往的自我冠名的批评方法的区别，批判的修辞始终伴随着漫长的学术发展史。不容忽视的是，学术研究的开展是离不开充斥着权力关系的社会环境的，CDA 必须提高对其自身的语言学权威的警惕性，这就要求 CDA 的研究方法必须突破业已确立的范式。第二，虽然 CDA 的倡导者认为语篇和社会结构之间的关系是辩证的，然而在具体的分析中却深受西方马克思主义批判理论的影响，强调社会结构对语篇的决定性作用，忽视语篇作为一种行为所能促成的积极影响。对否定性解构的过分强调在一定程度上削弱了其对现实的指导作用。第三，认知隐喻理论虽然被应用到 CDA 中并已经被证实可以揭示语篇中的权力关系，然而对概念隐喻理论同 CDA 的不相容性未能引起足够的重视。在认识到隐喻作为一种普遍的思维方式的同时，我们不能过分夸大语言的隐喻性，必须将隐喻理论同伯克的动机修辞学结合起来，才能更有效地对其意识形态作用作出解释。

鉴于以上对 CDA 的总结和反思，本研究认为有必要建立一个修辞学

视角下的批评性语篇分析，因为修辞学作为批评分析的公认形式，考察人们为了达到某种效果而建构话语的方式，它的特殊兴趣在于将话语实践作为权力形态和行事方式加以把握。作为致力于理解、掌握、开发和应用言语力量的一门学科，修辞学为我们理解权力和意识形态的运作提供了一个很好的切入点。修辞学视角下的研究在一定程度上可以消解对CDA的批评，推动修辞学与批评性语篇分析的建设性对话从而丰富我们对权力和意识形态运作方式的理解。

本研究采用定性的、阐释性的批评分析方法，通过汲取古典修辞学理论、美国新修辞学、传播研究和文化研究等相关学科的学术智慧，对修辞学视角对CDA的补充完善进行了尝试性探讨。本研究的理论基础是将意识形态看作是传播和权力的概念联系，从而确立意识形态与意义的社会建构之间的内在联系：一方面我们引入霍尔的意识形态理论，因为该理论建构了语篇与意识形态之间的辩证关系；另一方面，受Bygrave对修辞与意识形态关系阐述的启发，我们将伯克的语言作为象征性行为与主体性概念联系起来以克服CDA的解构主义取向。通过对修辞认知性的问题化，我们指出权力是意义建构的一个重要维度。对修辞、权力和意识形态之间关系的深刻洞察构成本研究的前提。通过对古典修辞学和当代修辞学中散见的对修辞“自我韬晦”的论述，明确了权力的修辞逻辑。在对汤普森的意识形态运作方式进行分析的基础之上，本研究提出修辞既是意识形态的载体又是揭露意识形态的工具。通过对修辞人格的解构，试图确立古典修辞学同批评性语篇分析的内在联系。

不可否认，修辞学的批评转向使其与CDA有着共同的研究兴趣。本研究对催生这一转向的新修辞代表人物肯尼斯·伯克的修辞思想对CDA的重要启示作用进行了初步探索。一方面明确了批评性语篇分析与伯克相似的语言观，突出伯克对人类象征行为的片面性和潜在邪恶有着解构式的洞察力；另一方面指出伯克毕生的信念——象征具有改变社会现实使其朝好的方向发展的巨大力量——为CDA指明了超越解构的发展方向。伯克将人界定为象征体系的制造者同时象征体系又反过来制造人，从而使其修辞学理论呈现更开放的体系，具备更流动的形式。他的“动机语法”可以更清楚地揭示语言背后所隐藏的动机，揭示占主导地位的社会群体是如何将权力隐藏并合法化，同时他的“动机修辞学”又是对

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

CDA 无限解构的超越。伯克的“批评之批评”要求 CDA 对自身的修辞性保持清醒的认识，进行不断自我反思以确保其批判的力度。

伯克的隐喻性语言观与其对隐喻的探讨密切相关，伯克的隐喻观成为我们思考隐喻建构、维护和颠覆权力关系的出发点。修辞学视角下的隐喻研究可以平衡目前隐喻研究对体验基础的过分强调，提出要理解隐喻的意识形态负载就必须深刻认识其对于修辞发明、论辩和评价的重要作用。

在确立了伯克的相关修辞思想对本研究的启发之后，本研究试图将伯克的戏剧五位法和隐喻分别应用于 9·11 后政治语篇的分析中，从而揭示新保守主义意识形态如何建构其“现实”，指出意识形态作为一种“术语视角”以特定方式引导我们对现实的理解。意识形态是对现实的简化，而要对抗主导意识形态，就要诉诸不同的“术语视角”和隐喻，通过不断的修辞干预，我们就有希望改变社会现实。

李艳芳

2011 年 3 月 7 日于郑州大学

Acknowledgements

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation. It is a pleasure to thank many people who have made its production and publication possible.

First and foremost, I owe a deep gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Hu Shuzhong from Shanghai International Studies University (SISU), for his unfailing encouragement, careful reading, insightful guidance and consistent help during the past three years. I treasure this lifetime opportunity he has granted me and I take this special opportunity to thank him, who is the light of hope that always guides me whenever I am lost at the academic sea.

My heartfelt thanks also go to all the professors in SISU who have selflessly imparted me the nectar of knowledge. Special thanks should go to my doctoral classmates and academic friends in the Ph.D. program of SISU, including Yuan Ying, Chen Yaping, Zhang Yufang, Cui Shuzhen, Ma Jingxiu, Zhang Yan, Li Mei, Dou Jun, Zhu Qian, Zhang Huixia, and many others. It is their academic inspiration and constant encouragement that accompanied me and drove away the blues that I felt occasionally during the writing process.

In particular I should express my appreciation for the leaders and colleagues at School of Foreign Languages, Zhengzhou University for their being considerate during my Ph.D. program. It is with their support and encouragement that I can finally accomplish the dissertation and finish my Ph.D. program.

My expression of gratitude would not be complete without acknowledging the most important person in my life, my husband. It is his devotion and generous love that have supported me throughout this academic journey. Special thanks should also go to my parents, whose unwavering support and absolute confidence prod me on in this long yet rewarding journey.

And lastly, I would like to thank my five-year-old adorable daughter, who learns the sweetness and bitterness at an early age when she most needs Mum's warmth. Being her mother inspired me to complete my dissertation and to achieve my potential.

I owe everything that I am and everything I have become to these special people in my life. I could not have done it without your endless love and support. I dedicate my work to each and every one of you.

Contents

Acknowledgements	x
List of Figures and Tables	xii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Origin and Rationale for the Present Study	1
1.2 Objectives of the Present Study	7
1.3 Research Methodology	8
1.4 Organization of the Dissertation	9
Chapter 2 Literature Review	13
2.1 Intellectual Background for CDA	13
2.1.1 Linguistic Turn in Intellectual Climate	13
2.1.2 Rhetorical Turn in Discourse Studies	15
2.1.3 Critical Turn in the Study of Discourse	17
2.2 CDA: An Overview	18
2.2.1 Genesis of Critical Discourse Analysis	18
2.2.2 A Diverse Picture of Research on CDA abroad	21
2.2.3 Research on CDA at Home	23
2.2.4 Research on Metaphor in CDA	23
2.2.5 Critical Response to CDA	25
2.3 Introduction of the Rhetorical Perspective	28
2.3.1 Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Criticism: Where They Converge and Diverge	30
2.3.2 Shared Focus between CDA and Critical Rhetoric	32
2.4 Summary	33

4.4.2.2 The Rhetorical Logic of Power 75
4.4.3 Rhetoric and Ideology 76
4.4.3.1 The Internal Modes of Operation of Ideology 76
4.4.3.2 Rhetoric as Carrier and Demystifier of Ideology 81
4.5 Etho as the Nexus between Rhetoric and CDA 84
4.5.1 Etho in Classical Rhetoric 84
4.5.2 Cambell's Theorizing of Etho 88
4.5.3 Postmodern Etho 90
4.6 Summary 91

Chapter 5 Deconstruction and Reconstruction: Kenneth Burke's Implication for CDA 93
5.1 Kenneth Burke and Rhetoric as Symbolic Action 94
5.1.1 A Synoptic View of Burke 94
5.1.2 Language as Metaphorical Selection 95
5.1.3 Terministic Screens as Constitutive of Rhetoric 100
5.2 Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pentad 102
5.2.1 The Power of Naming 102
5.2.2 Dramatism 103
5.2.3 The Paradoxical Term of Substance 108
5.3 A Rhetoric of Motives: Identification and Consubstantiality 110
5.4 The Burkean Framework: Deconstruction and Reconstruction 112
5.4.1 Kenneth Burke the Ideologist 112
5.4.2 Incorporation of Marx and Freud in the Rhetorical Framework 116
5.4.3 Reflection on Burkean New Rhetoric 117
5.5 Burke's Continued Relevance to Our Discussion of CDA 119
5.5.1 The Rhetoricality of CDA 119
5.5.2 Rhetorical Equipment for Living 120
5.6 Summary 123

7.1.2.7 Summary 160
7.2 Pentad Analysis 162
7.2.1 Introductory Remarks 162
7.2.2 Analyzing the President's Speech with Dramatic Pentad 163
7.2.3 Hidden Ideology at Work 167
7.3 Summary 169

Chapter 8 Conclusions and Implications 171
8.1 Major Findings and Contributions 171
8.2 Pedagogical Implications 173
8.3 Limitations of the Research 174
8.4 Areas for Future Research 174

Appendix 176
Bibliography 185

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

List of Figures and Tables

Table 1. Overlapping Concerns between Rhetoric and Discourse Analysis 31
Table 2. Modes of Operation of Ideology 78
Figure 1. The Pentad 105
Figure 2. Strategies of Identification 112
Figure 3. Metaphor as Legitimisation 161

It is generally acknowledged among the dissenters of CDA that a huge body of work is not mentioned at all within CDA, or referred to only fleetingly without any substantial evaluation of its relations to CDA. Michael Stubbs, for example, points out that despite CDA's insistence on the historical embedding of all language use, it fails to recognize that "it is posing the oldest question in philosophy" ("Whorf's Children" 212). Michael Toolan, too, suggests that "critical discourse analysts are attempting to garner kudos for themselves for being the first to 'really see and address' the workings of power in discourse" (223). The above criticisms point to the recognition of rhetoric of critique which has been accompanying the long history of academics. In his *Arguing and Thinking*, Michael Billig points out that the formulation of an academic theory inevitably occurs in the context of argumentation, so that the propounding of a theory involves the explicit, and sometimes implicit, criticism of alternative theories. The label "critical" bears a rhetoric of self-praise, for it is invariably a term that is applied to the self. "Uncritical" or "non-critical" is reserved for others. The critical approaches advocated by critical discourse analysts do not claim to be the inheritors of all previously self-labeled critical approaches and they attach particular meanings to their use of critical: the claim to be critical of the present social order, to be critical of other academic approaches that are not primarily addressed to the critique of existing patterns of dominance and inequality and to be critical of the social conditions of domination. Even this being the case, we have to be aware that academic work itself is conducted in the social context permeated with power relations. As Kress wrote, "all signs are... equally subject to critical reading for 'no sign is innocent' ("Against Arbitrariness" 74). So this makes the critical examination of their own discourse an imperative for critical analysts if they want to carry on their critical enterprise. Michael Billig suggests that CDA's academic success is double-edged, thus "if critical analysis fails to be self-reflexive then the critical enterprise can be compromised, to the extent that the critical limits of critique become ignored and thereby hidden" ("Critical Discourse Analysis and the Rhetoric of Critique" 37).

In sum, critical discourse studies must be aware of its own linguistic orthodoxies. This necessarily calls for approaches that are not tied to a single established paradigm in CDA. We thus hold a fixed way of doing critical analysis runs counter to the underlying epistemology of a critical approach, so we should guard against that tendency. This insight constitutes part of the rationale for our current research as we seek to transcend the established paradigm of CDA.

Other criticisms centre on the excessive negative deconstruction in CDA. Though advocates of CDA often assume that there is a dialectical relationship between discourse and social structure, in actual analysis they often tend to emphasize how the social structure shapes discourse while deemphasizes how as a mode of action discourse can bring positive outcome. "The negative deconstruction of the discursive universe indiscriminately into ideological criticism mars present investigations with radical reductionism, undermines the analytical thrust" (Ma Jingxiu 30). The call of affirmative agenda is also issued by Robert de Beaugrande, saying:

> The deconstruction of discourses sustained by a repressive ideology should be correlated with the construction of an emancipatory ideology whose discourse restores authentic, democratic meaning to such expropriated concepts as progress and socialism ("Critical Discourse Analysis from the Perspective of Ecologism" 116).

We remain deeply convicted about the need to go beyond what we might uncharitably characterize as "Watergate Linguistics"—the idea that by exposing language in the service of power we are contributing to a better world. As Gunther Kress comments:

> Changing circumstances call for a new goal in textual (and perhaps) other practice: not of critique but of Design...While critique looked at the present through the means of past production, Design shapes the future through deliberate deployment of representational

> resources in the designer's interest...The task of the critic is to perform analysis on an agenda of someone else's design. As a result a considerable degree of inertia is built into this process...Design sets aside past agendas, and treats them and their products as resources setting an agenda of future aims, and in assembling means and resources for implementing that ("Design and Transformation" 160–161).

Our research is very much oriented to the task of providing a possible way out for the above obsessions that plague CDA. We believe our solution lies partially in the integration of a rhetorical perspective into CDA. As we know, the status of rhetoric as the received form of critical analysis has long been recognized. The entrenched view of the discipline of rhetoric holds that the existing social order—its relations of exploitation, domination and oppression—can be transcended through symbolic intervention and collective recognition and resistance. So the rich heritage of rhetoric offers us a possibility to gain deeper insight into the working mechanism of power and hopefully, draw the inspiration to further the critical enterprise.

In her review of "What CDA is about", Ruth Wodak points out classical rhetoric is one of the roots of CDA (3). The importance of rhetoric to the maintenance of power has been documented throughout human history. Throughout its history, the study of rhetoric is fundamentally and thoroughly concerned with the analysis of texts in context—that is, their immediate context of arguer-audience-locality, but also (especially in the more "critical" approaches) the wider social, political and historic context(s) in which persuasive discourse is situated. We have to acknowledge that CDA and rhetoric share a lot in common. Both CDA and rhetoric hold that language is by no means value-free and mediates between us and the world to constitute, shape and distort our perception of the world. The two academic endeavours have a common mission of realizing man's emancipation. Understanding discourse within its situational and cultural contexts may indeed be the single greatest concern of those who are interested in rhetoric and this same concern is shared

by critical discourse analysts. Significant value is attached in both to the study of context, not only the immediate communicative context, but also the wider social context. However, given the shared concern between CDA and rhetoric, it is surprising that there is little cross-fertilization that might benefit both.

The linguistic manifestation of ideology is an archetypically rhetorical one in that it aims to convince and convert. In order to achieve conceptual hegemony and the illusion of truth, the agents of ideology use rhetoric to articulate concepts in as persuasive and convincing a manner as possible. Rhetoric thereby becomes an "artifact" of ideology. However there seems to be a relative absence of rhetorical theory or theory related to the persuasive dimensions of discourse in the scholarship of CDA, especially given the fact that rhetorical theorists have been concerned with the manufacturing of public opinion and collective identity for over two millennia. Despite the commonly acknowledged development of CDA, there is still comparatively little discussion of the significance of rhetoric to enriching the analytical framework of CDA. Our dissertation sets out to rectify this situation. We argue that although CDA and rhetoric are informed by distinct traditions, the former's emphasis on investigating subject positions within social hierachies and the latter's emphasis on investigating how social positions are transcended and/or coordinated, there are areas of overlapping that needs to be explored and the task of developing constructive dialogue between the two academic endeavours should be put on agenda.

Our conception of rhetoric in this dissertation obviously goes beyond the notion of and an interest for effective texts. Echoing Terry Eagleton, we conceive it as a theory and practice of discourse, encompassing all fields of human interest and activity, and functioning as negotiations about values and power in society. Throughout we hold that an insight into the mechanism of meaning creation can enhance our understanding of the way in which ideology functions.

it necessitates the metaphorical lens through which our discussion unfolds. Though it cannot be denied that there is much discussion of metaphor in CDA, most of them is from a cognitive perspective, drawing largely from conceptual metaphor theory expounded by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Our research is not meant as a denigration of the significance of cognitive linguistics in its explanatory adequacy for CDA, but we should be aware of the areas of inconsistence between cognitive linguistics and CDA. Inspired by Desmet's suggestion that we should "balance our sense of cognitive metaphor as a grammar that unproblematically reveals cognitive and social truth with a sense of metaphor as a disruptive trope that raises questions about the stability of its own grammar" (3), we hold that cognitive perspective is incapable of explaining the working mechanism of metaphor in the process of creating and sustaining ideology, as conceptual metaphor theory is in one way or another incompatible with CDA. Echoing the call of Desmet, we try to balance the notion of metaphor promoted by cognitive scientists with Kenneth Burke's sense that tropes are partial.

Prior to our discussion of the concept of etho in which the seed of contemporary thinking of CDA is buried, a broad picture of how rhetoric is closely linked to power and ideology is drawn. Not only is Kenneth Burke's rhetorical understanding introduced as a general background to situate our discussion of metaphor but also it casts light on the inevitable rhetorical nature of CDA (which critical discourse analysts often try to shun off), elucidating CDA with his dramatic pentad and complementing CDA with his identification theory. It will enable us to gain a deeper insight into the role of metaphor in creating, maintaining power and ideology as well as its potential to deconstruct them.

1.4 Organization of the Dissertation

To realize the above-mentioned research objectives, our ongoing study is organized into eight chapters.

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com