



研究生

高等院校英语语言文学专业研究生系列教材（修订版）

总主编 戴炜栋

语用学

Pragmatics

主编 何兆熊

Pragmatics



上海外语教育出版社

外教社 SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

www.sflep.com



研究生

高等院校英语语言文学专业研究生系列教材（修订版）

总主编 戴炜栋

语用学

Pragmatics

主编 何兆熊

编者 何兆熊 俞东明

洪 岗 王建华

 上海外语教育出版社
外教社 SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语用学 / 何兆熊主编. —上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2011
(高等院校英语语言文学专业研究生系列教材. 修订版)
ISBN 978 - 7 - 5446 - 2338 - 4

I. ①语… II. ①何… III. ①语用学—研究生—教材 IV. ①H03

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2011)第079521号

出版发行: 上海外语教育出版社

(上海外国语大学内) 邮编: 200083

电 话: 021-65425300 (总机)

电子邮箱: bookinfo@sflep.com.cn

网 址: <http://www.sflep.com.cn> <http://www.sflep.com>

责任编辑: 邬安安

印 刷: 上海信老印刷厂

开 本: 700×1000 1/16 印张 16.5 字数 363千字

版 次: 2011年8月第1版 2011年8月第1次印刷

印 数: 3 100 册

书 号: ISBN 978-7-5446-2338-4 / H · 1074

定 价: 28.00 元

本版图书如有印装质量问题, 可向本社调换



编委会名单

主任：戴炜栋

委员：(以姓氏笔划为序)

| | | | |
|-----|----------|-----|----------|
| 文秋芳 | 北京外国语大学 | 邹 申 | 上海外国语大学 |
| 王守仁 | 南京大学 | 陈建平 | 广东外语外贸大学 |
| 冯庆华 | 上海外国语大学 | 陈法春 | 天津外国语学院 |
| 申 丹 | 北京大学 | 罗选民 | 清华大学 |
| 石 坚 | 四川大学 | 胡文仲 | 北京外国语大学 |
| 刘世生 | 清华大学 | 赵忠德 | 大连外国语学院 |
| 刘海平 | 南京大学 | 殷企平 | 杭州师范大学 |
| 庄智象 | 上海外国语大学 | 秦秀白 | 华南理工大学 |
| 朱永生 | 复旦大学 | 梅德明 | 上海外国语大学 |
| 何兆熊 | 上海外国语大学 | 黄国文 | 中山大学 |
| 张绍杰 | 东北师范大学 | 黄源深 | 上海对外贸易学院 |
| 李建平 | 四川外国语学院 | 程晓堂 | 北京师范大学 |
| 李绍山 | 解放军外国语学院 | 程爱民 | 南京大学 |
| 杨信彰 | 厦门大学 | 蒋洪新 | 湖南师范大学 |

总 序

随着我国经济的飞速发展，社会对以研究生为主体的高层次人才的需求日益增长，我国英语语言文学专业的研究生教育规模也在不断扩大。要使研究生教育持续健康地发展，培养学生创新思维能力和独立研究与应用能力，必须全面系统地加强基础理论与基本方法的训练。而要实现这一目标，就必须有一套符合我国国情的、系统正规的英语语言文学专业研究生主干教材。

基于这一认识，上海外语教育出版社于21世纪之初邀请全国英语语言文学专业各研究领域中的知名专家学者，编写了“高等院校英语语言文学专业研究生系列教材”，迄今已陆续出版了二十余种。这套系列教材集各高校之所长，优势互补，形成合力，在教材建设方面，把我国英语语言文学专业的研究生培养工作推上了一个新的台阶，规范了我国英语语言文学专业的研究生课程，为高校培养基础扎实、知识面广、富有开拓精神、符合社会需要的高质量研究生提供了条件。

该系列教材的编写结合了我国英语语言文学专业研究生教学的实际情况与需要，强调科学性、系统性、先进性和实用性，力求体现理论与应用相结合，介绍与研究相结合，史与论相结合，原创与引进相结合，全面融会贯通。每一种教材都能够反映出该研究领域的新理论、新方法和新成果。系列教材推出后不仅被作为我国英语语言文学专业研究生的主干教材，也被作为中国语言文学专业的教师与学生的参考用书。

在多年的使用过程中，全国各高校的英语语言文学专业的专家学者和教师对该系列教材提出了许多建设性的建议。近几年，英语语言文学研究也有了新的发展。为了吸纳这些建设性建议



及最新的学科研究成果，进一步完善教材，我们对该系列教材进行了修订。此次修订的主要方面有：内容上查漏补缺，进一步提升教材质量；理论上与时俱进，反映最新的学科研究成果；体例上规范统一，提高学术的严谨性；资料上充实丰富，增加教学资源；版式上全新设计，增强教材的易教性。此外，我们还对该系列教材的选题进行了拓展和延伸，在邀请国内专家学者编写原创教材的同时，精选国外原版教材引进出版。修订后的“高等院校英语语言文学专业研究生系列教材”在选题上中西合璧，覆盖了英语语言文学专业各学科的主要课程，学科方向将更齐全，更能满足我国英语语言文学专业研究生教育在学科建设方面的需求。

教材建设是学科建设的一项重要基本建设，对学科发展有着深远的影响。我们相信，在新世纪推出的这套系列教材，必将大大推动我国英语语言文学专业研究生教育事业的发展，促进我国英语语言文学研究水平的提高。

戴炜栋
2009年5月

编写说明

早在本世纪之初我们就想过用英语编写一本供研究生使用的语用学教材。这一想法来自我们编写的《新编语用学概要》一书于2000年出版后各方面的反响。当初我们编写《新编语用学概要》时，意在编一本兼有专著和教材功能的书，既起到向国内读者引介国外语用学研究成果的作用，也可以为高校研究生语用学这门课程提供一本可做参考的教材。在国内自编语用学教材尚为鲜见的情况下，《新编》一书出版后颇受欢迎，不少学校都把它选作语用学课程的教材。随后，由于在许多高校语用学这门课程是用英语开设的，于是有不少同仁向我们建议用英语编写一本类似的教材，以方便教师和学生。恰逢上海外语教育出版社推出了研究生系列教材出版项目，客观上为我们这个想法的实现创造了条件。

最近二三十年语用学发展很快，新的成果层出不穷，但如果把它作为一门课程来学习，我们认为学生首先要熟悉、掌握这个学科的一些最基本的内容，包括这个学科的渊源、发展路径、主要理论、成果和研究方法等等。因此这本教材纳入的依然是我们认为作为学生对这个学科所必须掌握和了解的最基本的内容。众所周知，国外语用学研究有英美学派和欧洲大陆学派两大家，本教材以英美学派的研究成果为主，对近年欧洲大陆学派推出的两个极有影响的理论（即顺应论和关联论）没有作专章介绍，其原因是这两大理论的创始人对自己的理论都有专著作了十分全面和系统的介绍，而这两大理论的内容又很难归纳到某一章里去。

本教材共有10章，由当年编写《新编语用学概要》的四名编者再度合作编写。具体分工如下：第1、3、7章由何兆熊编写，第2、6、9章由俞东明编写，第4、5章由王建华编写，第8、10章由洪岗编写。

对于研究生课程的教材，我们始终认为，每门课程都应该至少有一本教材，但没有一本教材能涵盖一个学科的全部内容；因此，任何一门研究生课程都不应只限于使用一本教材，教师可根据具体情况向学生介绍、推荐多种教材和参考书，我们仅希望本书至少能够成为语用学这门课程的教材之一。

编者
2010年8月

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 1.1 | The origin and development of pragmatics | 1 |
| 1.1.1 | The philosophical origin..... | 1 |
| 1.1.2 | The growth of pragmatics in modern linguistics | 2 |
| 1.1.3 | The two traditions of study | 5 |
| 1.2 | Definitions of pragmatics | 6 |
| 1.3 | Pragmatic study of meaning | 7 |
| 1.4 | The notion of context..... | 11 |
| 1.4.1 | The early explications of context..... | 11 |
| 1.4.2 | The role of context in utterance interpretation..... | 13 |
| 1.4.3 | The dynamic nature of context | 15 |
| 1.4.4 | The manipulability of context..... | 16 |
| | Study questions | 17 |
| | Further reading | 18 |

Chapter 2 Reference and Deixis

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.1 | The notion of reference | 19 |
| 2.2 | Major types of reference..... | 21 |
| 2.2.1 | Definite reference | 21 |
| 2.2.2 | Indefinite reference | 23 |
| 2.2.3 | Generic reference | 24 |
| 2.2.4 | Non-referential uses of referring expressions | 25 |
| 2.3 | The philosophical studies of reference | 26 |
| 2.3.1 | Two theories of reference | 26 |
| 2.3.2 | Two distinct uses of definite descriptions..... | 27 |
| 2.4 | Referential opacity..... | 29 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 2.5 | The pragmatic nature of reference..... | 30 |
| 2.5.1 | The indeterminacy of reference..... | 30 |
| 2.5.2 | The role of co-text and context..... | 32 |
| 2.6 | The notion of deixis..... | 34 |
| 2.7 | The pragmatic nature of deixis..... | 35 |
| 2.7.1 | Deixis and linguistic communication..... | 36 |
| 2.7.2 | Two different uses of deixis..... | 37 |
| 2.7.3 | Deixis and cohesion in text..... | 38 |
| 2.8 | Major types of deixis..... | 39 |
| 2.8.1 | Person deixis..... | 39 |
| 2.8.2 | Temporal deixis..... | 41 |
| 2.8.3 | Spatial deixis..... | 43 |
| 2.8.4 | Discourse deixis..... | 46 |
| 2.8.5 | Social deixis..... | 48 |
| | Study questions | 49 |
| | Further reading | 50 |

Chapter 3 Speech Act Theory

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 3.1 | Origin of the speech act theory..... | 51 |
| 3.1.1 | Austin's initial distinction between constatives and performatives..... | 51 |
| 3.1.2 | Linguistic features of the performatives..... | 52 |
| 3.1.3 | The happiness conditions of a performative act..... | 53 |
| 3.1.4 | The alternative three-act distinction..... | 54 |
| 3.2 | Speech act theory in the post-Austinian age..... | 55 |
| 3.2.1 | The illocutionary act and propositional content..... | 56 |
| 3.2.2 | Rules and conditions for the successful performance of an act..... | 57 |
| 3.2.3 | Classification of illocutionary speech acts..... | 58 |
| 3.3 | Indirect speech acts..... | 62 |
| 3.3.1 | The phenomenon of indirect language..... | 62 |
| 3.3.2 | Indirect speech act..... | 63 |
| 3.3.3 | The process to infer the primary illocutionary point..... | 64 |
| | Study questions | 65 |
| | Further reading | 66 |

Chapter 4 Conversational Implicature

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------|----|
| 4.1 | Introduction..... | 67 |
| 4.2 | Cooperative Principle..... | 67 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.3 | Conversational implicature..... | 70 |
| 4.4 | Different kinds of implicatures..... | 72 |
| 4.5 | Non-observance of conversational maxims..... | 74 |
| 4.5.1 | Flouting a maxim..... | 74 |
| 4.5.2 | Violating a maxim | 75 |
| 4.5.3 | Opting out of a maxim..... | 76 |
| 4.5.4 | Infringing a maxim..... | 77 |
| 4.5.5 | Suspending a maxim | 77 |
| 4.6 | Properties of conversational implicature | 78 |
| 4.7 | Neo-Gricean studies | 83 |
| 4.7.1 | Levinson's three-principle formula | 84 |
| 4.7.2 | Sperber & Wilson's Relevance Theory | 85 |
| | Study questions | 86 |
| | Further reading | 87 |

Chapter 5 Pragmatic Studies of Politeness

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 5.1 | Introduction | 88 |
| 5.2 | Conversational-maxim view of politeness | 88 |
| 5.2.1 | Politeness Principles..... | 88 |
| 5.2.2 | Irony Principle and Banter Principle..... | 92 |
| 5.2.3 | Pragmatic scales | 93 |
| 5.2.4 | Some problems with the maxims | 95 |
| 5.2.5 | Leech's reformulation of the PP maxims | 97 |
| 5.3 | Face-saving theory of politeness | 98 |
| 5.3.1 | Politeness strategies..... | 98 |
| 5.3.2 | Calculating weightiness of an FTA..... | 104 |
| 5.3.3 | Problems with the politeness strategies..... | 107 |
| | Study questions | 109 |
| | Further reading | 109 |

Chapter 6 Pragmatic Studies of Conversation

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 6.1 | Some local management systems of conversation | 111 |
| 6.1.1 | The identification and differentiation of <i>turn</i> and <i>back-channel item</i> | 111 |
| 6.1.2 | Turn-taking..... | 113 |
| 6.1.3 | Adjacency pairs and beyond..... | 115 |
| 6.2 | The organization of repair in conversation..... | 118 |
| 6.3 | The overall organizations of conversation | 120 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 6.3.1 Conversational openings | 120 |
| 6.3.2 Conversational closings..... | 121 |
| 6.4 Dynamic studies of conversation..... | 123 |
| 6.4.1 Discourse roles and their switching..... | 124 |
| 6.4.2 Pragmatic ambivalence and conversational strategies | 129 |
| 6.4.3 Pragmatic studies of activity types | 137 |
| Study questions | 139 |
| Further reading | 140 |

Chapter 7 Presupposition

| | |
|--|-----|
| 7.1 Presupposition defined..... | 141 |
| 7.2 Pre-pragmatic studies of presupposition | 142 |
| 7.2.1 Philosophers' studies of presupposition | 142 |
| 7.2.2 Semanticists' studies of presupposition..... | 142 |
| 7.3 Pragmatic interpretations of presupposition..... | 143 |
| 7.4 Presupposition triggers | 146 |
| 7.5 Cancellability — a characteristic of presupposition..... | 149 |
| 7.6 The projection problem of presupposition | 151 |
| Study questions | 153 |
| Further reading | 153 |

Chapter 8 Cross-cultural Pragmatics

| | |
|--|-----|
| 8.1 Introduction | 154 |
| 8.2 Defining cross-cultural pragmatics..... | 155 |
| 8.2.1 Defining culture..... | 155 |
| 8.2.2 Defining cross-cultural | 156 |
| 8.2.3 Defining pragmatics | 156 |
| 8.3 The major content of cross-cultural pragmatics | 159 |
| 8.3.1 Development of cross-cultural pragmatics..... | 159 |
| 8.3.2 Pragmalinguistics | 161 |
| 8.3.3 Sociopragmatics | 166 |
| Study questions | 171 |
| Further reading | 171 |

Chapter 9 Application of Pragmatics: Demonstration Analysis

| | |
|--|-----|
| 9.1 The multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary nature of pragmatics | 173 |
| 9.2 Application of speech act theory to dramatic texts | 175 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 9.2.1 | Conventional/institutional acts and drama | 175 |
| 9.2.2 | Indirect speech acts and drama..... | 176 |
| 9.2.3 | Indirect speech acts and drama: an example in Chinese | 182 |
| 9.3 | Application of the CP to dramatic texts | 184 |
| 9.3.1 | Sample analysis (1) | 184 |
| 9.3.2 | Sample analysis (2) | 186 |
| 9.3.3 | Sample analysis (3) | 187 |
| 9.4 | Application of the PP to dramatic texts..... | 189 |
| 9.5 | Application of presuppositions and deixis to dramatic texts | 193 |
| 9.5.1 | Presuppositions and dramatic texts | 193 |
| 9.5.2 | Application of deixis to dramatic texts..... | 194 |
| 9.6 | Application of discourse roles to dramatic texts | 197 |
| 9.6.1 | Producers of talk in drama..... | 197 |
| 9.6.2 | Receivers of talk in drama..... | 199 |
| 9.7 | Pragmatic ambivalence, conversational strategies and the analysis of dramatic texts | 202 |
| 9.7.1 | Pragmatic ambivalence and drama..... | 202 |
| 9.7.2 | Conversational strategies and drama..... | 204 |
| 9.8 | Application of register analysis to dramatic texts | 207 |
| 9.9 | Application of turn-taking to dramatic texts | 211 |
| | Study questions | 214 |
| | Further reading | 215 |

Chapter 10 Pragmatics Research Methodology

| | | |
|--------|--|-----|
| 10.1 | What is research? | 216 |
| 10.2 | Types of data collection procedures..... | 218 |
| 10.2.1 | Instruments for perception | 219 |
| 10.2.2 | Instruments for production..... | 222 |
| 10.3 | Conclusion..... | 234 |
| | Study questions | 236 |
| | Further reading | 236 |

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----|
| | References | 237 |
| | Glossary | 250 |

Introduction

1.1

The origin and development of pragmatics

1.1.1 The philosophical origin

All social activities of human beings are driven by intentions. Linguistic activity is no exception. Basically, the aim of pragmatics is to explain how we use language to successfully achieve our intentions.

The term “pragmatics” was originally used by philosophers, not by linguists. It will be beneficial for a better understanding of the nature of pragmatics to have some knowledge of how the term initially came into use.

The use of the term is usually attributed to two American philosophers C. Morris and R. Carnap, who first introduced the term “pragmatics” in their study of semiotics in the 1930s. Morris distinguished three aspects of semiotic inquiry, i.e. syntactics (or syntax), being the study of the “formal relation of signs to one another”, semantics, the study of the “relation of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable,” and pragmatics, the study of “the relation of signs to interpreters.”(qtd. in Levinson, 1983: 1)

Carnap adopted the following version of the trichotomy:

If in an investigation explicit reference is made to the speaker, or to put it in more general terms, to the user of the language, then we assign it (the investigation) to the field of pragmatics ... if we abstract from the user of the language and analyze only the expressions and their designata, we are in the field of semantics. And, finally, if we abstract from the designata also and analyze only the relations between the expressions, we are in logical syntax.

(Levinson, 1983: 2–3)

1. 1. 2 The growth of pragmatics in modern linguistics

Pragmatics is a relatively young branch of linguistic studies. It was not until the second half of the 20th century that some linguists and scholars in related areas of research became aware of the pragmatic features of language. Henceforth, serious investigations began. Pragmatics developed quickly. The rise and growth of pragmatics is the natural outcome of the expansion of the field of modern linguistics and the deepening of its studies. What follows is a brief overview of the development of modern linguistics.

Like any other field of science, modern linguistic studies have been a process of continuous exploration and development. The publication of the Swiss linguist F. de Saussure's book *Course in General Linguistics* at the beginning of the 20th century is generally regarded as marking the birth of modern linguistics. In this book Saussure made a number of important dichotomies in the study of linguistics, of which is the well-known and significant one between "langue" and "parole." These two French words correspond to the two English terms "language" and "speech" respectively, the former referring to the system of language *per se* and the latter to the actualization of this abstract system. Saussure's purpose in making such a distinction is to single out one aspect of language for serious study, i.e. the abstract language system, not the use of language, which was considered by him as "heterogeneous". The keynote for modern linguistics was thus set by Saussure and it remained dominant for about half a century. It was echoed about 50 years later by the American linguist N. Chomsky's dichotomy of competence and performance, despite the difference in the two scholars' views with regard to the essence of human language.

This explains why for quite a long period of time modern linguists almost entirely devoted themselves to the study of language itself, keeping the actual use of language out of their scope of study. To the pioneer of American structuralism, J. Bloomfield and a whole generation of linguists following him, linguistics simply meant phonetics, phonemics, and morphology, and syntax was considered so abstract that it was virtually beyond the horizon of discovery. With his proposal of a syntax-centered linguistic theory in the late 1950s, Chomsky, so to speak, started a revolution in the world of linguistic studies. Placing grammaticality at the core of his language theory, Chomsky still regarded meaning as altogether too messy for serious contemplation. Then, in the 1960s–1970s some linguists tried to incorporate meaning into a formal linguistic theory. This was an important advancement in modern linguistic study as meaning finally found its way into the field. Yet initial investigations of meaning were limited to the inherent, abstract meaning of

language. But once the door was opened, there could be no more exclusion of the notion of context from the linguists' research. "So pragmatics was henceforth on the linguistic map. Its colonization was only the last stage of a wave-by-wave expansion of linguistics from a narrow discipline dealing with the physical data of speech, to a broad discipline taking in form, meaning, and context." (Leech, 1983: 2)

The brief review above has summarized the major developmental stages of linguistic studies on the American continent. On the other side of the Atlantic, Europe has an even longer history and a tradition of its own in academic pursuit. Some distinguished linguists and scholars have put forward creative theories and viewpoints that have contributed to the establishment of pragmatics as an independent branch of study. For example, the noted British linguist J. Firth, under the influence of his tutor the Polish anthropologist B. Malinowski, called attention to the importance of the notion of context in the explication of language meaning as early as the 1930s. The essence of his idea is that only in context can language meaning be identified.

The contemporary British linguist M. A. K. Halliday, holding a social view of language, has proposed a comprehensive functionalist language theory. According to Halliday, the universals of human languages are not due to the biological features we humans share, but due to the social functions we humans all want our languages to perform for us. From a functional perspective, the evolution of human language into its present status is determined by the functions language is supposed to perform to satisfy the social needs of human beings; thus describing and explaining language in terms of its structure and use cannot be divorced from its functions. Functional language theories have played a role in promoting the development of pragmatics.

Although pragmatics is admittedly a branch of linguistic study, its establishment and development are not entirely attributable to linguists. The names of some philosophers are closely associated with it and in a sense serve as milestones in its development, as Huang Yan (2007: 2-3) succinctly states:

When it came to the 1950s, two opposing schools of thought emerged within the analytic philosophy of language: the school of ideal language philosophy and the school of ordinary language philosophy. The central ideas underlying the former were originated by the philosophers Gottlob Frege, Alfred Tarski, and Bertrand Russell.

Ideal language philosophers were primarily interested in the study of logical systems of artificial languages. However, the partially successful application of its theory and methodology to natural language in the 1950s and 1960s by followers of the school such as Richard Montague,

David Donaldson, and David Lewis led to the development of today's formal semantics. By contrast, within the tradition of ordinary language philosophy, emphasis was placed on natural language rather than the formal languages studied by the logicians ... Other leading thinkers of the school included the philosophers H. P. Grice, Peter Strawson, John Searle, and the later Ludwig Wittgenstein.

It was within the tradition of ordinary language philosophy that in the late 1950s the British ordinary language philosopher J. Austin proposed the **Speech Act Theory**, which has become a core theory in the whole area of pragmatic studies, and at the same time has exerted a strong influence on such interdisciplinary branches as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics. Another is P. Grice, the British/American philosopher who proposed the **Cooperative Principle** based on the discrepancy between formal logic and natural language logic and his theory of conversational implicature. Although the principle/theory has some weaknesses and has been challenged with criticisms, it still remains a powerful mechanism in the explanation of language meaning. As Huang states, "On the linguistics front, in the late 1960s and early 1970s a campaign was launched by some of Noam Chomsky's disaffected pupils in generative semantics, notably Jerry Katz, J. R. Ross and George Lakoff, to challenge their teacher's treatment of language as an abstract, mental device divorced from the uses and functions of language ... who were attracted to the philosophical work by Austin, Grice, Strawson, and Searle, helped to empty what the philosopher Yehoshua Bar-Hillel called the 'pragmatic wastebasket' ..." (Huang Yan, 2007: 2-3)

Then, as a social phenomenon, language activities have also drawn the attention of sociologists. In the 1960s-70s, some American sociologists H. Sacks, E. A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson, applying the methods used in sociological research, analyzed some data taken from authentic conversations in an attempt to discover the laws governing the structure of natural conversation. Their findings have remained an important part of pragmatics literature.

Since the late 1980s the cognitive trend in the study of linguistics as a whole has also spread to pragmatics, and a new branch of pragmatic studies, cognitive pragmatics has come into being. Of the various cognition-based theories and frameworks proposed, the most influential is perhaps the **Relevance Theory** proposed by D. Sperber and D. Wilson (1986).

To sum up, diachronically speaking, pragmatics is the outcome of the development of modern linguistics, and to some extent it is an interdisciplinary field of research because it is an area where scholars of related