

电视访谈中话语缓和的语用研究

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF MITIGATION IN TELEVISION INTERVIEW TALKS

李海辉 著



《暨南外语博士文库》

获广东省优势重点学科建设项目和暨南大学重点学科建设项目资助



中国出版集团



世界图书出版公司

电视访谈中话语缓和的语用研究

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF MITIGATION IN TELEVISION INTERVIEW TALKS

李海辉 著

《暨南外语博士文库》

主 编 / 宫 齐
副主编 / 王 琢 / 蒲若茜



中国出版集团
世界图书出版公司

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

电视访谈中话语缓和的语用研究: 英文/李海辉著.
—广州: 世界图书出版广东有限公司, 2014. 1
ISBN 978-7-5100-5542-3



I. ①电… II. ①李… III. ①电视—语言艺术—研
究—英文 IV. ①G222.2

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2014)第005003号

电视访谈中话语缓和的语用研究

策划编辑: 刘正武

责任编辑: 程 静

出版发行: 世界图书出版广东有限公司

(广州市新港西路大江冲25号 邮编: 510300)

电 话: (020) 84451969 84453623 84184026

http://www.gdst.com.cn E-mail: pub@gdst.com.cn

经 销: 各地新华书店

印 刷: 广东天鑫源印刷有限责任公司

版 次: 2014年1月第1版

印 次: 2014年1月第1次印刷

开 本: 880mm × 1 230mm 1/32

字 数: 240千

印 张: 8.5

ISBN 978-7-5100-5542-3/H·0842

定 价: 35.00元

版权所有 侵权必究

咨询、投稿: 020-84460251 gzlzw@126.com

总 序

暨南大学创办于1906年，是我国第一所由国家创办的华侨高等学府，是目前在全国招收港澳台和海外华侨学生最多的高校，是国家“211工程”重点综合性大学。“暨南”二字出自《尚书·禹贡》篇：“东渐于海，西被于流沙，朔南暨，声教讫于四海。”意即面向南洋，将中华文化远播到五洲四海。

暨南大学外国语学院的前身是创办于1927年的外国语言文学系，历史上曾有许多著名专家、学者在该系任教，如叶公超、梁实秋、钱钟书、许国璋等。1978年复办后，外语系在曾昭科教授、翁显良教授的主持下，教学与科研成绩斐然，1981年外国语言文学系获国家第一批硕士学位授予权，成为暨南大学最早拥有硕士授予权的单位之一。当时的英语语言文学硕士点以文学为主、专长翻译，翁显良、曾昭科、张鸾铃、谭时霖、黄均、黄锡祥等一大批优秀学者先后担任硕士研究生导师，他们治学严谨，成绩卓著，为我们今天的发展奠定了坚实的基础。

如今，外国语学院已拥有专任教师138人，其中教授10人，副教授46人，讲师70余人。教授中有博士生导师2人，硕士生导师37人。学院教师中获博士学位者36人，在读博士20余人。现有英语语言文学系、商务英语系、日语系、法语系和大学英语教学部等5个教学单位，有外国文学研究所、应用语言研究所、跨文化及翻译研究所、日本语言文化研究所及外语教学研究中心等5个专门的研究机构。学院现有外国语言文学硕士学位一级学科授权点，有英语语言文学、外国语言学及应用语言学、日语语言文学3个二级学科，以及翻译硕士专业(MTI)学位授权点。英美文学方向主要为华裔美国文学研究、英美女性文学和英美后现代文学研究；外国语言学及应用语言学方向以理论语言学、功能语言学和音系学为研究特色；日语

语言文学方向侧重现当代日本文学、日中比较文学、日语语言及中日文化研究；翻译方向从语言学、文学和文化等多个层面探讨翻译理论与实践，突出翻译的实践性。研究生导师大多数具有海外大学或学术机构从事教学、科研和进修的经历。目前，学院教师主持国家社科基金项目6项，教育部、广东省社科规划项目数十项。

《暨南外语博士文库》丛书(以下简称《文库》)是暨南大学外国语学院部分获博士学位教师的研究成果，它的编纂主要基于以下目的：首先，是对近十几年来我校外语学科获博士学位教师研究成果的梳理；其次，为我校中、青年外语学人搭建展示团队科研成果的平台，以显示本学科发展的集群效应；第三，旨在激励暨南外语学人不断进取，勇攀教学、科研的新高峰，再创新辉煌。《文库》主要收录了2000年以后我校外语学科博士学位获得者尚未正式出版的博士论文，这些论文均经本人反复修改和校对，再经相关方向博士生导师的认真审阅后提交出版社排版付梓。《文库》涵盖了语言学、外国文学、翻译、文化及其他相关学科，涉及语种包括汉语、英语、日语、法语、西班牙语等。《文库》第一批拟出版8部，其他教师的博士论文将在此后陆续编排、出版。

《文库》的成果是新一代暨南外语学人孜孜不倦、努力奋进的结晶，是他们宁静致远、潜心治学的象征。这些成果代表了暨南外语学科的进步与发展，预示着我们的未来和希望，这也是我们献给暨南大学110周年校庆和外国语学院90周年华诞的一份厚礼。

《文库》的出版得到了广东省优势重点学科建设项目和我校重点学科建设项目的支持，此外世界图书出版公司在本套丛书的编辑、设计等方面付出了大量心血，在此我们一并表示衷心感谢！

编 者

2013年12月16日

序

那是上世纪90年代末的一段日子。李海辉从暨南大学赶来广东外语外贸大学，旁听我主讲的硕士学位课程“语用学”，每周一次，风雨无阻，他求知的坚毅与努力给我留下了深刻印象。此后，到了本世纪初，他就以优异的成绩被广东外语外贸大学的外国语言学及应用语言学研究センター录取，在我名下攻读语用学方向的博士学位。李海辉有很好的外语基础，他在博览群书，特别是研读国外话语研究成果的基础上，结合汉语话语实际，选定“话语缓和语”作为自己的论题，开始过着一段兼顾日常教学与学位论文写作的艰苦、漫长的日子。

那时，冉永平教授和我都在语言学及应用语言学研究中心工作，我特意请他作为博士生副导师，协助我指导李海辉的论文写作。当我退离工作岗位后，李海辉最终在冉永平教授的指导下完成了现在付梓的博士论文——《电视访谈中话语缓和的语用研究》，顺利通过了答辩，取得博士学位。

对话语缓和语进行专题研究是很有意义的。我们知道，冲突与缓和是人际交往中普遍存在的两种状态，也是语言使用中言语行为、话语、词汇等选择及其语境制约下语力博弈的两种常态；同时，化解冲突，实现语言缓和与人际关系和谐是交际主体意在努力实现的永恒主题，这是人类社会发展的内在需要，也是人类理性的重要表现。为此，受制于人际之间的社交语用目的，缓和手段（mitigating devices）、缓和语（mitigators）等广泛存在于语言交际之中。自20世纪80年代以来，以Bruce Fraser, Claudia Caffi等为代表的国际学者将语言使用中的缓和现象（mitigation）引入现代语用学研究，使其成为了语用学的研究对象。

近年来，国内学者对该现象的研究成果日益增多，尤其是基于

汉语交际中的缓和语言研究，出现了一些从语用学的角度探究汉语文化语境下缓和现象的成果。比如，李海辉的这本博士论文《电视访谈中话语缓和的语用研究》以中央电视台节目《实话实说》为语料，在语用学理论的指导下，探讨实现语用缓和的策略类型、语境制约因素以及语用缓和的功能等，这属于动态语境下媒体话语的语用学研究，其中的话语选择既受制于说话人之间的人际语用关系，也体现了媒体交际语境下话语使用的机构性特征。也就是说，类似研究不完全等同于日常交际中话语缓和的语用学研究。

李海辉认为，缓和就是言语交际中说话人刻意降低其施为力度，以减缓话语负面效果的一种语用策略。在话语内容可能造成对听话人的面子损伤、情感伤害或心理打击时，说话人往往设法阻滞此类效果的产生，这就是话语缓和。它是言语行为的施为力度与成事效果的同步弱化。根据施为力度的发生层面以及言语行为的三分法，话语缓和策略包括命题缓和、施为缓和与成事缓和三种主要形式，其表现特征为说话人弱化自身话语的认知、道义背书，亦即说话人拥有的话语权利与义务，这些不同于现有文献中的研究发现。在言语交际中，它们可以消除听话人对交际的抵触心理，实施面子维护、情感安抚等人际功能与规劝、说服等交际功能。从Jef Verschueren的语言顺应论的角度来说，无论是策略的选择还是功能的实现，均为语言顺应的结果。

基于语料分析，李海辉在本论文中认为，从利益取向看，话语缓和是既利他也利己、先利他而后利己的。顺应本质上是利己的，但也可以是利他的，而移情是纯利他的。移情涵盖了顺应，但顺应并非总是移情。故此，制约话语缓和的机制是一种特殊的顺应机制——移情顺应。与非移情顺应相比，移情顺应遏制了说话人采取话语加强以及听话人选择交际规避。移情顺应的主要特征是相互性。话语缓和的策略选择源于说话人对听话人的面子、情感、心理需求的趋同、认同，而其功能的实现取决于听话人对说话人交际意图的

协同、配合，这就是相互移情顺应。这是语言顺应论视角下的话语缓和功能。

移情顺应可以为话语缓和与礼貌之间的关系提供如下解释。缓和并非总是礼貌，礼貌也并非总是缓和，二者之间不存在谁蕴含谁的问题，不是子母集或并集关系。缓和与礼貌的关系是交集关系，其共核是利他，而利他也是移情顺应的本质特征。这些都是这本博士论文中富有启发性的见解，令人欣喜。

可以说，李海辉的研究进一步拓展了话语缓和的探索范围，特别是对媒体话语的语用学研究。人际交往中的缓和语、弱势语等有助于减弱所在话语的驱使性，或维护交际主体的面子、身份地位等，是维护人际关系的有效手段，更是人际和谐管理的需要与表现，否则可能出现冲突性话语，引发人际之间的不和谐。为此，话语缓和的系统研究是十分必要的。

话语研究是宏观语用学研究中的一个重要项目。人际交往的语用问题涉及话语的表达和理解，它在社会、文化、心理、认知等方面与人们有着千丝万缕的复杂关系，汉语话语的语用研究还有一大片未开垦的处女地，值得我们从跨学科的角度去探索话语语用的方方面面，丰富语用学研究。李海辉博士在本论文中取得的成果正好表明他在这方面迈出了可喜的一步。

何自然

冉永平

2013年10月8日

于广州白云山

Abstract

Mitigation is a pervasive phenomenon of language use that inherits much theoretical importance from the indispensability of the illocutionary force of a speech act to doing things with words. It involves a breaching of the Gricean maxims of conversation and generates nonconventional implicatures, which makes it an interesting topic of research. Mitigation is also a pragmatic strategy which the speaker uses in various ways in adaptation of different contextual factors to perform diverse functions at the interpersonal and the communicative dimensions. Despite its importance, it has been understudied in that more attention has been given to classifying its strategies than to describing its functions and explaining its mechanism. As a partial response to such limitations, the present study aims to make an integrative study of mitigation in ordinary language use. Based on Chinese data obtained from television interview talks and adopting a qualitative research methodology, it attempts to answer the following questions: 1) What are the mitigating strategies? 2) What contextual factors constrain the use of mitigation? 3) What functions does mitigation perform? 4) What is the general mechanism of mitigation?

Mitigation is defined in the present study as a pragmatic strategy whereby the speaker reduces the illocutionary force of his speech act in order to soften an unpleasant effect that is detrimental to the achievement of his communicative goal. By illocutionary force is meant the justifiability of the speaker's illocution and the determination with which the speaker goes on record performing the illocution. By unpleasant effect is meant one of the perlocutionary sequels of the ensuing speech act. This definition involves two criteria, a reduction of the illocutionary force and

a softening of an unpleasant effect, in comparison to previous definitions which take only one criterion. The adoption of this strict definition is justified to the extent to which it isolates prototypical instances of mitigation to the exclusion of peripheral cases and makes the present study more systematic and manageable. However, although both criteria are indispensable to the qualification of mitigation, the satisfactions of them do not have to be simultaneously manifested in the semantic meaning or the explicatures of the mitigator. In fact, in most cases only the satisfaction of one of them is made explicit while that of the other is left implicit and takes inference to be recovered.

Mitigation can be classified into propositional mitigation, illocutionary mitigation and perlocutionary mitigation. Propositional mitigation explicitly operates on illocutionary vagueness, illocutionary mitigation on illocutionary non-endorsement while perlocutionary mitigation works on the speaker's concern or control over a perlocutionary sequel. All these trigger off a negotiation or a reshuffling of rights and obligations between the speaker and the hearer, and, by the principle of synchronic weakening, succeed in softening a negative effect of the speech act that is detrimental to the achievement of the speaker's communicative goal. Through a detailed analysis of the data, the present study has found that there is sufficient regularity in the manner in which the illocutionary force is reduced or the unpleasant effect is softened to further classify mitigation into several subcategories. Thus, propositional mitigation subsumes under it strategies such as understaters, evidentials, tag questions, epistemic modals and subjectivizers, among which understaters work on propositional fuzziness while the others work on the uncertainty of the speaker's propositional attitude. Illocutionary mitigation incorporates disclaimers, deprecators, truth claimers and hesitators, among which

disclaimers encode the speaker's illocutionary non-endorsement more explicitly than the others. Perlocutionary mitigation includes strategies such as simple anticipation, concern showing, penalty taking and direct dissuasion, among which direct dissuasion represents the most explicit effort of control. Such findings contribute to a better understanding of mitigation than is provided by earlier studies, which directed their attention overwhelmingly to propositional mitigation.

Like other phenomena of language use, mitigation is subject to the constraint of various contextual factors. It has been found that mitigation is interadaptable with powers, negative emotions, controversies, taboo topics and social values. These factors are highly relevant to the interview talks in which mitigation occurs, so there is self-evident correlation between the two. In addition, there are social norms related to these factors that require the speaker to mitigate his illocutionary force so as to be socially and communicatively rewarded rather than sanctioned. Mitigation is seen in this light as the result of linguistic adaptation to these factors and their corresponding norms. Moreover, when mitigation occurs, there is often a linguistic description of a social factor or the social norm related to it which constitutes the background for the use of mitigation and serves as the standard by which the illocution is characterized in the light suggested in the mitigator. In other words, the characterization is made with reference to the social norm. Thus, mitigation only makes sense when seen as a faithful representation of social norms, as an apology for a violation of the social norms and as an attempt to downplay the seriousness and the consequences of the violation. By analyzing examples extensively, the present study has found that different contextual factors constrain language use in their unique ways and are correlated with specific mitigating strategies. Thus, power in the hearer entitles him to

more speaking rights and obligations and constrain the speaker into using tag questions and disclaimers typically to limit his own speaking rights and obligations. Negative emotions in the hearer call for the speaker's understanding and sympathy and constrain him into using deprecators, disclaimers and the strategy of concern showing predominantly. Controversies require the speaker to respect and acknowledge others' different views and lead the speaker to employ subjectivizers, epistemic modals more frequently than other strategies. Taboo topics motivate the speaker to use disclaimers to avoid violating them or to use deprecators to apologize for an inevitable violation. Social values such as modesty, honesty and restraint require the speaker to present himself as upholding these values by means of subjectivizers and disclaimers. It has also been found that these contextual factors are especially relevant to specific participants in the interview and lead to the clustering of different mitigating strategies around different participants. The host, for example, has to constantly adapt to the power in the guest or the honored guest and to the negative emotions in the guest, therefore his mitigating style is characterized by a combination of tag questions, deprecators and disclaimers. Controversy and the value of modesty are especially relevant to the honored guest, who overwhelmingly uses subjectivizers to adapt to the different views held by other honored guests and to present themselves as being modest. The guest has little to adapt to, his concern being to recount his experience or feelings as accurately as possible. The audience have only to adapt to the competition for the speaking floor and guest's negative emotions, so they mostly use subjectivizers to take and keep the floor and use the truth claimer “实话实说” to pacify the guest while making unreserved outpourings.

Mitigation is used to perform various functions in specific contexts

in accordance with the speaker's communicative goal. Mitigating functions include interpersonal functions and communicative functions. Interpersonal functions refer to the contribution made by mitigation to the maintenance or improvement of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer while communicative functions refer to the role played by mitigation in heightening communicative involvement or effectiveness. At the interpersonal level, mitigation performs the functions of image management, pacification and solidarity building. At the communicative level, it performs the functions of invitations, floor manipulations and persuasions. Through a detailed analysis, the present study has found that these functions are regularly associated with specific participants who use different strategies to adapt to specific contextual constraints. Thus, image management is especially relevant to the host and the honored guests, who use deprecators, subjectivizers and disclaimers to adapt to social values and taboo topics to avoid being negatively evaluated. Pacifications are the result of the host's adaptation to the guest's negative emotions by means of concern showing and disclaimers. Solidarity building occurs between the host and the guest who feels ill at ease at the beginning of the interview. The inviting functions result from the host's adaptation to the guest's experience or negative emotions or to the honored guest's expertise by means of tag questions, disclaimers, and concern showing. Floor manipulations are realized due to the mitigator's performativity, negotiability and by creating psychological expectations in the hearer, mostly through the use of subjectivizers by the audience. Persuasions are the ultimate goal of communication aimed to be reached through all forms of mitigation.

Four patterns emerge from a summary of the findings concerning the mitigating strategies, the contextual constraints on mitigation and

the mitigating functions. Firstly, tag questions are almost exclusively used by the host, who adapts to the power in the guest or the honored guest in order to perform inviting functions. This is consistent with the observation that the host is mainly concerned with securing a maximal degree of participation in the interview to make it run smoothly. Secondly, the subjectivizer “个人认为” is surprisingly monopolized by the honored guests whose power entitles them to speak more assertively. This is explained by one honored guest’s empathic adaptation to the controversial views held by another in order not to impose and not to be imposed upon, as well as to appear modest. Thirdly, subjectivizers such as “我认为” and “我有个观点” are favored by the audience, who adapt to the strong competition for the speaking floor in order to seize and keep the floor. Fourthly, the truth claimer “实话实说” is favored by all participants partly because it justifies an unreserved outpouring while mitigating resentment and partly because it has come into vogue due to the popularity of the TV program.

It has further been found that mitigation is inherently related to empathy. On the one hand, it involves an incongruence, such as underrepresentation, irrelevance, redundancy or contradiction, between the semantic meaning of the mitigator and the speaker’s illocutionary intention. This semantic incongruence can only be reconciled by assuming that in the use of mitigation the speaker is taking the hearer’s perspective, showing affective convergence to the hearer and being altruistic to him. On the other hand, despite being aware of the problematic nature of his illocution and despite his wish to empathize with the hearer, the speaker goes on record performing the illocution. This seeming irrationality can only be explained away by assuming that the speaker is bidding for the hearer’s empathy on the ground of reciprocity. In other words, by the use

of mitigation the speaker is also attempting to get the hearer to take his perspective, converge to his affect and make an altruistic interpretation of his utterance. These constitute the speaker's empathic intention in engaging in mitigated communication. Metapragmatically speaking, through the use of mitigation the speaker explicitly communicates his empathic intention to the hearer and hopes thereby to realize various mitigating functions. Mitigation conveys the metapragmatic message that in general or in other contexts the speaker would agree with the hearer, but in the present context he would expect the hearer to agree with him. In terms of interpretational constraints, the speaker discourages the hearer from making a conventional interpretation of the utterance but constrains him into making a novel and altruistic interpretation based on the adoption of the speaker's perspective.

In order to account for mitigation, the present study proposes the notion of empathic adaptation. Adaptation is egoistically oriented, empathy is altruistically oriented while mitigation is both altruistic and egoistic. Thus empathic adaptation captures the very nature of mitigation, namely that it is egoistic via being altruistic. The explanatory power of this notion is manifested in its account of the motivation of mitigating strategies and the realization of mitigating functions. On the one hand, the use of mitigation can be viewed as resulting from the speaker's empathic adaptation to various contextual constraints. That is, the speaker does not only have to take his communicative goal into account, but also has to adopt the hearer's perspective and affect with regard to the corresponding constraint. Given the egoistic orientation of adaptation, the speaker would probably opt for reinforcement rather than mitigation if he were not empathic with the hearer. Conversely, if the speaker empathizes with the hearer while adapting to the contextual constraint to reach his

communicative goal, he will naturally choose mitigation as it takes care of both needs. On the other hand, the realization of mitigating functions can be viewed as resulting from the hearer's empathic adaptation to the speaker's mitigating strategy. If the hearer adapted to the speaker's use of mitigation, but were not empathic with the speaker, he would be stuck in his own perspective or preoccupied with his own affect, so much so that he would fail to see the speaker's perspective and mitigation would fail to realize its functions. But if he empathizes with the speaker while adapting to his use of mitigation, he will interpret the utterance in a way that is advantageous to the speaker. If and only if this happens can the mitigating functions be realized.

In sum, mitigation is a multidimensional and multifunctional phenomenon that takes a multiperspectival research paradigm to reveal its intricacies. The present study has explored the mitigating strategies, the contextual constraints on mitigation, the mitigating functions and the mechanism of mitigation, yet it is more extensive than intensive, more rudimentary than systematic and more tentative than conclusive. It has only revealed the tip of the iceberg, which awaits more penetrating studies to come.

Key words: mitigation, mitigating strategies, contextual constraints, mitigating functions, empathic adaptation

摘 要

话语缓和 (mitigation) 是一种常见的语用现象, 涉及对格莱斯会话原则的违背以及非常规会话含意的产生, 因此它是一个有趣的、值得深入研究的课题。话语缓和也是一种形式多样的语用策略, 其目的是通过顺应各种语境因素及相关社会规约对话语内容和方式的制约, 实现人际及交际功能。尽管如此, 话语缓和现象没有得到足够的重视, 体现在它的众多功能没有被发现, 工作机制没有得到有力的解释。鉴于此, 我们有必要对日常交际中的话语缓和现象进行多维度综合考察。本研究以中央电视台《实话实说》节目的转写文本为语料, 采用定性研究方法, 尝试回答以下问题: 一、话语缓和有哪些策略? 二、话语缓和受什么语境因素的制约? 三、话语缓和可以实施什么功能? 四、话语缓和的工作机制是什么?

本研究将话语缓和定义为说话人为了达到其交际目的而采取的弱化施为力度、减缓负面效果的策略。这是一个涉及双重标准的严式定义, 一方面要求满足弱化施为力度的条件, 另一方面要求能够淡化某个负面效果, 只有这样才可称为话语缓和。与以往众多定义相比, 严式定义可以分离出典型的话语缓和实例, 使研究更趋系统, 易于驾驭。严式定义的双重标准不必同时显现, 多数情况下只显现一个标准, 另一个隐含其中。

受 Austin (1962) 言语行为三分法的启发, 我们首先将话语缓和分为命题型缓和、施为用意型缓和及成事效果型缓和。命题型缓和与施为用意型缓和直接作用于施为力度的弱化而间接导致负面效果的减缓, 成事效果型缓和则直接作用于负面效果的减缓而间接表达施