

SELECTED

READINGS

FOR

PRAGMATICS

语用学 文献选读

● 何兆熊 主编

上海外语教育出版社

SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

WUJI
外教社

何兆熊 主编

语用学文献选读

SELECTED READINGS FOR PRAGMATICS

上海外语教育出版社



图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语用学文献选读 = Selected Readings for Pragmatics
/何兆熊主编. — 上海:上海外语教育出版社,2003
ISBN 7-81080-499-5

I. 语… II. 何… III. 语用学-文集-英文
IV. H0-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2002)第 044227 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: 021-85425300 (总机), 35051812 (发行部)

电子邮箱: bookinfo@sflep.com.cn

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

责任编辑: 张惠忠

印 刷: 上海市印刷四厂

经 销: 新华书店上海发行所

开 本: 850×1168 1/32 印张 32 字数 1002 千字

版 次: 2003 年 9 月 第 1 版 2003 年 9 月 第 1 次印刷

印 数: 3 500 册

书 号: ISBN 7-81080-499-5 / G · 269

定 价: 39.90 元

本版图书如有印装质量问题,可向本社调换

前 言

早在十多年前,在给研究生开设语用学课程的过程中,我们就产生了选编一本国外语用学读本的想法。作为一门研究生课程,除了教师的讲授之外,学生必不可少地需要研读有关文献,但要做到每一个学生都能拿到应该阅读的文章却实非易事。由于种种原因,这个想法在当时没能实现。十多年过去了,如今不论国外资料的来源,还是复印的普及程度和当年都不可相比了,但在教学过程中,每讲到一个题目总还是会遇到复印材料的麻烦,再者,复印的费用在目前仍称不上低廉。仅从服务于教学这一个角度来看,选编这本读本就是一件很有实际意义的事。

语用学是一门引进的学科,但和语言学的任何一个分支一样,语用学研究的是人类语言交际中具有普遍性的东西,因此在语用学的研究中不应该有中外的界线。对于国外的学术成果,我们反对全盘照搬,但借鉴参照、洋为中用是我们的一贯方针。因此不论是学习还是研究语用学,我们都需要参阅国外的语用学文献,时时关注国外的研究动态,从中寻找合理的、可以为我所用的部分,以加深对语用学的理解,促进我们自己的语用学的研究。

在语用学不算太长的历史中积累了数量不算太小的文献,其中值得一读的不少,但出于各方面的考虑,在我们这本读本里只能按 12 个题目选收极其有限的 35 篇。我们认为这 12 个题目大体上涵盖了语用学研究的最主要的内容,每个题目下入选的文章几乎可以说是加深对这个题目的了解的必读文章。我们所选的文章绝大多数出自英美学者之手,时间跨度大约为 20 世纪的最后 40 年。当然,和

每个题目相关的可以读、应该读的文章还有很多,但我们所选的至少可以满足最低的需要。在每一章前我们写了一个简单的导读,对所选文章作了一个很简单的介绍,以方便读者使用。原文的注释绝大多数是解释性的,我们一般予以保留,但限于篇幅,原书、原文的参考书目我们便略去了。近年来国外有几种语用学选读本面世,但不同读本编者的选材各有特点,读者尽可各取所需。

对本书所选的 35 篇阅读文献的原作者及有关出版社我们表示衷心的感谢,感谢他们对我们工作的支持,对中国语用学教学和研究的支持。

我的三位博士研究生俞东明、王建华和洪岗为我提供了部分材料,参加了篇目的遴选,并撰写了部分导读。对他们的努力和贡献我深表谢意。

最后,这本读本是上海市教委重点学科项目“九十年代语用学研究”的一个部分,在选编出版过程中我们得到了上海市教委和上海外语教育出版社的大力支持,我们谨向他们表示衷心的感谢。

编者

2001 年 1 月

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1	Introduction	1
1.	Defining Pragmatics	3
	In Levinson, S. <i>Pragmatics</i> , 5 – 27, Cambridge University Press, 1983.	
2.	What is Pragmatics?	32
	In Thomas, J. <i>Meaning in Interaction</i> , 1 – 23, Longman Group Limited, 1995.	
3.	Defining Pragmatics	65
	In Mey, J. <i>Pragmatics: An Introduction</i> , 35 – 42, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1993.	
CHAPTER 2	Sense and Reference	75
4.	Reference & Reference as a Theory of Meaning	77
	In Saeed, J. I. <i>Semantics</i> , 25 – 31, 1997.	
5.	Reference and Definite Descriptions	88
	Donnellan, K., in Davis, S. <i>Pragmatics: A Reader</i> , 52 – 64, 1991.	
6.	Speaker's Reference and Semantic Reference	115
	In <i>ibid.</i> , 77 – 96.	
CHAPTER 3	Deixis	157
7.	The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity	159
	Brown and Gilman, in Giglioli, P. (ed.) <i>Language and Social Context</i> , 252 – 282, Penguin, 1972.	
8.	Deixis I	175
	In Fillmore, C. <i>Lectures on Deixis</i> , 59 – 75, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Leland	

Standford Junior University, 1997.

9. Indexicals and Anaphora: Contextually Identifiable Indeterminacies of Reference 194

In Green, G. *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*, 17 – 35, Erlbaum Associates Publishers, New Jersey, 1989.

CHAPTER 4 Speech Act Theory 221

10. Constatives and Performatives 223

Austin, J. , in Olshewsky, T. M. (ed.) *Problems in the Philosophy of Language*, 242 – 250, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

11. What Is a Speech Act? 237

Searle, J. , in Giglioli, P. (ed.) *Language and Social Context*, 136 – 154, Penguin, 1972.

12. A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts 260

In Searle, J. *Expression and Meaning — Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, 1 – 29, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

CHAPTER 5 Indirect Language 283

13. Indirect Speech Acts 285

In Searle, J. *Expression and Meaning — Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, 30 – 57, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

14. Two Types of Convention in Indirect Speech Acts 316

Morgan, J. L. , in Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, Academic, New York, 261 – 280, 1978.

15. Pragmatics and Indirectness 343

In Thomas, J. *Meaning in Interaction*, 119 – 133.

CHAPTER 6 Cooperative Principle and Neo-Griceanism 363

16. Logic and Conversation	365
Grice, H. P., in Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (eds.) <i>Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts</i> , Academic, New York, 41 – 58, 1978.	
17. On Testing for Conversational Implicature	389
Sadock, J. M., in Cole, P. & Morgan J. L. (eds.) <i>Syntax and Semantics 9: Pragmatics</i> , Academic, New York, 282 – 298, 1978.	
18. The Principal Principles of Pragmatic Inference: Cooperation	412
Turner, K., in <i>Language Teaching</i> 28: 67 – 76, Cambridge University Press, 1995.	
CHAPTER 7 Relevance Theory	433
19. Relevance and Understanding	435
Wilson, D., in Brown, G. et al. <i>Language and Understanding</i> , 37 – 58, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.	
20. Relevance	467
In Blakemore, D. <i>Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics</i> , 24 – 37, 1992.	
21. Précis of <i>Relevance: Communication and Cognition</i>	487
Sperber, D. & Wilson, D., in <i>Behavioural and Brain Science</i> 10/4: 697 – 710, 1987.	
CHAPTER 8 Pragmatic Studies of Politeness	531
22. A Survey of the Interpersonal Rhetoric	533
Leech, G., in <i>Principles of Pragmatics</i> , 131 – 151, 1983, London: Longman.	
23. The Argument: Intuitive Bases and Derivative Definitions	562
From Brown & Levinson <i>Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena</i> , in Goody, E. (ed.) <i>Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interactions</i> ,	

Cambridge University Press, 56 – 289, 1978.

24. Beyond Politeness Theory: 'Face' Revisited and Renewed 595
Mao, L. R., in *Journal of Pragmatics* 21 (1994),
451 – 486.

CHAPTER 9 Cross-Cultural Pragmatics 645

25. Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of
Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) 647
Blum-Kulka, S., Olshtain, E., in *Applied Linguistics*
5/3:196 – 213, 1984.
26. Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure 677
Thomas, J., in *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 91
– 111, 1983.
27. Interlanguage Pragmatics: An Introduction 715
In Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) *Interlanguage
Pragmatics*, 3 – 17, New York: Oxford University
Press, 1993.

CHAPTER 10 Presupposition 735

28. Pragmatic Presuppositions 737
Stalnaker, R. C., in Milton, K., Munitz & Unger, P.
(eds.) *Semantics and Philosophy*, 471 – 481, New York
University, 1974.
29. Presupposition and Entailment 760
Yule, G., in *Pragmatics*, 25 – 34, Oxford University
Press, 1996.

CHAPTER 11 Pragmatic Studies of Conversation 773

30. A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-
taking for Conversation 775
Sacks, H. A., et al. in *Language* 50/4, 696 – 735.
31. Sequencing in Conversational Openings 839
Schegloff, E., in Gumperz, J. J. & Hymes, D. (eds.)

Directions in Sociolinguistics, 349 – 371, N. Y. : Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

32. Activity Types and Language 884
Levinson, S. C. , in *Linguistics*, 17: 365 – 399, 1979.

CHAPTER 12 Data-Collection Methods in Pragmatics Research 929

33. Research Methodology and the Question of Validity 931
Wolfson, N. , in *TESOL Quarterly* 20/4: 689 – 698, 1986
34. Research Methods in Interlanguage Pragmatics 944
Kasper, G. & Dahl, M. , in *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13/1: 215 – 245, 1991.
35. Conceptions of Social Relations and Pragmatics Research 987
Spencer-Oatey, H. , in *Journal of Pragmatics* 20, 27 – 47, 1993.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

作为导论,本章的中心是对语用学这个领域本身的理解,即语用学是研究什么的,这个领域的范围有多广,语用学和语言学其他分支领域的关系如何。语用学发端于 20 世纪六七十年代。在它兴起之时,人们对语用学究竟是什么并不很清楚,甚至对它能否算得上是一个独立的语言学研究分支也有人表示怀疑。在过去的三四十年里,在对语言现象进行大量语用研究的同时,对语用学本身的认识也日渐加深。尽管语用学和某些学科的界限有些模糊(这并不奇怪,因为语用学在某种意义上是跨学科的),且迄今语言学界对语用学仍缺少一个众口一词的定义,但应该说,今天人们对语用学本质的认识要比三四十年前清楚、深刻了许多。

本章的第一篇选自 Levinson 的专著 *Pragmatics*。该书出版于 1983 年,堪称语用学研究的一部经典著作。我们节选了书中第一章的 1.2 节 Defining pragmatics 的大部分,在这一部分里 Levinson 并没有给读者一个明确的语用学的定义,却对许多个可能的定义进行了比较详尽的讨论。这并没有让读者失望,因为一个高度概括的定义往往使人感到难以把握,有时还免不了会带有一些片面性。相反,通过对这一领域从各个不同的角度进行探索 and 勘测,反倒使读者对这个领域的了解更全面、更深入,从而获益。这正是 Levinson 的

目的所在。

第二篇选自 Thomas 1995 年出版的 *Meaning in Interaction — An Introduction to Pragmatics* 一书。我们全文转载了该书的第一章 What is pragmatics? 正如书名所示, Thomas 对语用学的定义可概括为“对互动意义的研究”, 她对语用学的定义从意义着手。Thomas 对意义的理解具有独到之处, 在本章里她提出了意义的三个层次之说: 抽象意义、话语意义和语势, 并指出意义并非由说话人或听话人单方产生, 而是一个双方参与的动态的建构过程。文中例子丰富, 文字通俗, 易读易懂。

第三篇选自 Mey 的 *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (1993) 中第三章 Defining pragmatics。这一章共有 8 节, 我们选了第 1 到第 4 节, 其中 Mey 谈了语用学的定义和语境两个方面, 这两个方面显然是有紧密联系的。Mey 认为语用学是语言使用的理论, 但他对语用学的理解十分宽泛, 在交际过程中涉及到的任何一种人的因素, 不论是心理的、社会的, 还是生理的, 都可纳入语用学的研究范围。这个观点代表了欧洲大陆学者对语用的理解。对于语境, Mey 区分了 societal context 和 social context, 我们不妨称它们为“大语境”和“小语境”, 大语境指宽泛的社会语境, 小语境指包容在大语境之中的具体的交际语境。Mey 把语用学定义为对受社会语境制约的人类语言使用的研究。Mey 对语用学的理解侧重于社会性, 他十分强调语言使用者的重要性和社会语境的作用。

1

Defining Pragmatics

S. Levinson

1.2 Defining Pragmatics

The relatively restricted sense of the term pragmatics in Anglo-American philosophy and linguistics, and correspondingly in this book, deserves some attempt at definition. Such a definition is, however, by no means easy to provide, and we shall play with a number of possibilities each of which will do little more than sketch a range of possible scopes for the field. This diversity of possible definitions and lack of clear boundaries may be disconcerting, but it is by no means unusual: since academic fields are congeries of preferred methods, implicit assumptions, and focal problems or subject matters, attempts to define them are rarely wholly satisfactory. And indeed, in one sense there is no problem of definition at all: just as, traditionally, syntax is taken to be the study of the combinatorial properties of words and their parts, and semantics to be the study of meaning, so pragmatics is the study of language usage. Such a definition is just as good (and bad) as the parallel definitions of the sister terms, but it will hardly suffice to indicate what the practitioners of pragmatics actually do; to find that out, as in any discipline, one must go and

take a look.

Nevertheless, there are reasons for attempting at least some indication of the scope of pragmatics. In the first place, it is simply a sufficiently unfamiliar term. In the second place, it is not so easy to just "go and take a look" at what workers in pragmatics do: there are (at the time of writing) no available textbooks, only one specialist journal (*Journal of Pragmatics*) and that covering the broader Continental usage of the term, only a handful of monographs and a few collections of papers. Nevertheless, there is much work scattered throughout the various journals of linguistics and philosophy. Thirdly, some authors seem to suggest that there is no coherent field at all; thus Lyons (1977a: 17) states that "the applicability [of the distinction between syntax, semantics and pragmatics] to the description of natural languages, in contrast to the description or construction of logical calculi, is, to say the least, uncertain," while Searle, Kiefer & Bierwisch (1980: viii) suggest that "*Pragmatics* is one of those words (*societal* and *cognitive* are others) that give the impression that something quite specific and technical is being talked about when often in fact it has no clear meaning." The pragmaticist is thus challenged to show that, at least within the linguistic and philosophical tradition that is the concern of this book, the term does have clear application.

Let us therefore consider a set of possible definitions of pragmatics. We shall find that each of them has deficiencies or difficulties of a sort that would equally hinder definition of other fields, but at least in this way, by assaults from all flanks, a good sketch of the general topography can be obtained.

Let us start with some definitions that are in fact less than satisfactory. One possible definition might go as follows: pragmatics is the study of those principles that will account for why a certain set of sentences are anomalous, or not possible utterances. That set might include:¹

- (1) ??Come there please!
- (2) ??Aristotle was Greek, but I don't believe it
- (3) ??Fred's children are hippies, and he has no children
- (4) ??Fred's children are hippies, and he has children
- (5) ??I order you not to obey this order
- (6) ??I hereby sing
- (7) ??As everyone knows, the earth please revolves around
the sun

The explanation of the anomalies exhibited by these sentences might be provided by pointing out that there are no, or at least no ordinary, contexts in which they could be appropriately used.² Although an approach of this sort may be quite a good way of illustrating the kind of principles that pragmatics is concerned with, it will hardly do as an explicit definition of the field — for the simple reason that the set of pragmatic (as opposed to semantic, syntactic or sociolinguistic) anomalies are presupposed, rather than explained.³

Another kind of definition that might be offered would be that pragmatics is the study of language from a **functional** perspective, that is, that it attempts to explain facets of linguistic structure by reference to non-linguistic pressures and causes. But such a definition, or scope, for pragmatics would fail to distinguish linguistic pragmatics from many other disciplines interested in functional approaches to language, including psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. Moreover, it may be plausibly argued that to adopt a definition of this sort is to confuse the *motives* for studying pragmatics, with the *goals* or general shape of a theory (about which more later).

One quite restricted scope for pragmatics that has been proposed is that pragmatics should be concerned solely with principles of language usage, and have nothing to do with the description of linguistic structure. Or, to invoke Chomsky's distinction between **competence** and **performance**, pragmatics is

concerned solely with performance principles of language use. Thus, Katz & Fodor (1963) suggested that a theory of pragmatics (or a theory of **setting selection** as they then called it) would essentially be concerned with the disambiguation of sentences by the contexts in which they were uttered. In fact it is clear that contexts do a lot more than merely select between available semantic readings of sentences — for example, irony, understatement and the like are kinds of use that actually create new interpretations in contexts. Still, one could claim that grammar (in the broad sense inclusive of phonology, syntax and semantics) is concerned with the context-free assignment of meaning to linguistic forms, while pragmatics is concerned with the further interpretation of those forms in a context:

[Grammars] are theories about the structure of sentence types ... Pragmatic theories, in contrast, do nothing to explicate the structure of linguistic constructions or grammatical properties and relations ... They explicate the reasoning of speakers and hearers in working out the correlation in a context of a sentence token with a proposition. In this respect, a pragmatic theory is part of performance. (Katz, 1977:19)

This position has a number of adherents (Kempson, 1975, 1977; Smith & Wilson, 1979), but it has a serious difficulty. The problem is that aspects of linguistic structure sometimes directly encode (or otherwise interact with) features of the context. It then becomes impossible to draw a neat boundary between context-independent grammar (competence) and context-dependent interpretation (performance). This problem is unwittingly illustrated by Katz's explication of this boundary: he points out that the pairs *rabbit* and *bunny*, or *dog* and *doggie* differ in that the second member of each pair is appropriately used either by or to children. Since the distinction is one relating

to the appropriate users of the terms in a context, the distinction would not be part of a linguistic description of English, which would merely note that the members of each pair are synonymous. However, it is clear that the distinction is built into the language, in just the same way that in many languages degrees of respect between participants are encoded in lexis and morphology. Katz suggests that in order to ascertain whether a linguistic feature is context-dependent or context-independent, we imagine the feature occurring on an anonymous postcard (as an approximation to the empty or **null context**).⁴ But if we apply this criterion we see that the implication or inference that speaker or addressee is a child is as available when *bunny* is written on an anonymous postcard as it is when said in some concrete appropriate context (Gazdar, 1979a: 3). And that of course is because the kind of appropriate speaker or addressee is encoded by the term *bunny*.

Here we come to the heart of the definitional problem: the term *pragmatics* covers both context-dependent aspects of language structure and principles of language usage and understanding that have nothing or little to do with linguistic structure. It is difficult to forge a definition that will happily cover both aspects. But this should not be taken to imply that pragmatics is a hodge-podge, concerned with quite disparate and unrelated aspects of language; rather, pragmaticists are specifically interested in the inter-relation of language structure and principles of language usage. Let us now consider some potential definitions that are more plausible candidates.

We may begin with a definition that is specifically aimed at capturing the concern of pragmatics with features of language structure. The definition might go as follows:

- (8) Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are **grammaticalized**, or encoded in the structure of a language⁵