



Evidentiality in English Linguistics
Research Articles

英语学术论文中的 言据性研究

杨林秀 / 著



科学出版社

教育部人文社科研究青年项目(11YJC740128)结项成果

Evidentiality in English Linguistics Research Articles

英语学术论文中的言据性研究

杨林秀 著



科学出版社

北京

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

英语学术论文中的言据性研究 = Evidentiality in English linguistics
research articles: 英文 / 杨林秀著. —北京: 科学出版社, 2015. 4

ISBN 978-7-03-043905-5

I. ①英… II. ①杨… III. ①英语—论文—研究 IV. ①H315

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2015) 第 055147 号

责任编辑: 阎 莉 刘彦慧 / 责任校对: 郑金红

责任印制: 张 倩 / 封面设计: 铭轩堂

联系电话: 010-6401 9074 / 电子邮箱: liuyanhui@mail.sciencep.com

科学出版社出版

北京东黄城根北街 16 号

邮政编码: 100717

<http://www.sciencep.com>

三河市骏杰印刷有限公司 印刷

科学出版社发行 各地新华书店经销

*

2015 年 3 月第 一 版 开本: 720 × 1000 1/16

2015 年 3 月第一次印刷 印张: 12 1/2 插页: 1

字数: 210 000

定价: 78.00 元

(如有印装质量问题, 我社负责调换)

作者简介



杨林秀，1976年9月生，山西稷山人，副教授。1994年考入山西大学外国语学院。1998~2001年于山西大学师从李悦娥教授研读语用学。2001年开始执教于山西大学外国语学院。2005~2009年在厦门大学外文学院师从杨信彰教授攻读博士学位，研究方向为系统功能语言学。2009年博士毕业之后，回到山西大学外国语学院继续执教至今。

自博士期间开始“言据性”研究之后，近年来本人的研究兴趣一直在“语篇中的言据性”，关注言据性在语篇中的呈现规律和人际意义。曾先后在《当代语言学》，《外语教学》，《山东外语教学》，*Journal of Pragmatics*, *Discourse Studies*, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 等国内外核心刊物上发表论文二十余篇。并以“言据性”为研究对象先后获得了“教育部人文社科青年基金”和“国家社科青年基金”，并于2013年9月至2014年9月获国家留学基金委资助赴英国伯明翰大学语料库中心访学。2013年入选教育部新世纪优秀人才支持计划。

序

听到杨林秀博士即将出版 *Evidentiality in English Linguistics Research Articles* 一书,我感到十分高兴,也向她表示祝贺。她在厦门大学攻读博士学位的过程中,认真学习,态度端正,刻苦钻研,克服各种困难展开研究工作,积极参加国内的学术活动,在本学科的核心刊物上发表了多篇学术论文。在确定学位论文选题之后,杨林秀博士能广泛阅读有关言据性理论的各种书籍和论文,大量搜集资料,对选题进行多方面的思考,顺利完成了博士学位论文的研究和写作工作。

言据性是人们长期研究的语言现象之一,各种语言学理论从不同角度对它进行了探讨,但能从语篇和语类的层面,对言据性的人际功能展开研究的并不多见。杨林秀博士在书中从系统功能语言学的角度出发,把言据性看做一种语义概念,其主要功能是表示信息来源和作者对事实的态度。书中对言据性进行分类,并建立一个由三个成分组成的人际功能模式,着力研究英语科研论文中言据性的各种表现方式,把言据性看作构建作品的一种语篇策略。因此,该书一方面提供了研究言据性的新视角,一方面丰富了言据性研究的内容。

杨林秀博士在回顾国内外学者对于言据性和学术论文研究的基础上,进行归纳分析,并指出以前研究的不足之处,从而提出研究框架,认为人际视角和语类是影响作者认知态度、言据手段选择的主要因素,言据性可作为评价、元话语和作者身份的指示手段。该书还广泛收集了英语科研论文建立语料库,通过量化分析,详细地观察和比较了以英语为母语的科研界和我国学者科研论文中言据性手段的使用情况,从而得出了有意义的结论。

杨林秀完成博士阶段的学习后,回到了其母校山西大学工作。近年来,她在科研上取得了突出的成绩,以“言据性”为研究对象承担了多项国家级、省部级的科研课题,在国内外刊物上也发表了多篇文章,从广度和深度上都对言据性研究做出了贡献。今后,我期望看到她在语言学的研究上取得更多的成果。再次祝贺杨林秀博士论著的出版!

杨信彰

2014年12月8日于厦门

前言

言据性(Evidentiality)是近年来颇受语言学界青睐的一个研究课题。自美国人类学家 Franz Boas 在上世纪初首先提及这一语言现象以来,许多学者对言据性研究产生了浓厚的兴趣。尤其是 20 世纪 80 年代以来,言据性研究更是出现了方兴未艾的可喜局面,许多论文和专著也相继问世。在国内,语言学家也逐渐增加了对言据性研究的关注。

虽然言据性研究的局面已打开,并成为语言学领域一个不可忽视的研究课题,但就目前的研究状况来看,言据性研究仍处于不成熟阶段,有很多问题有待于进一步研究和探讨。目前的言据性研究主要集中于以下几个方面:有些研究者仍然把研究重点放在对一些曲折性语言的语法据素描写上,这样的语法描写只是言据性研究的一个方面,而且对于像英语这样无语法据素的语言来说,语法据素描写似乎没有多大意义;目前的大多数研究还停留在词汇和句子层面,在语篇和语类的层面对言据性的关注并不多见,尤其是对学术语篇中言据性的呈现形式和规律以及言据性的意义的研究更是寥寥;目前的言据性研究对言据性在具体语篇中的人际意义和功能的研究还不充分。房红梅(2005)曾指出言据性的人际功能,并说明了言据性表达人际意义的本质,为言据性在语篇中的人际意义的探讨打下了基础。

基于目前言据性研究的状况,本论著的研究重点是英语学术论文中言据性及其人际意义和功能。我们以系统功能语言学为理论基础,并借助语类,认知立场,元语篇等概念,从三个方面对英语语言学学术论文中的言据性展开研究:1)通过对语料的定量分析,首先勾画出英语语言学学术论文中的言据性使用的全景图,概括出言据性和学术论文语类结构的密切制约关系,为言据性人际意义的探讨提供了数据上的支持;2)建立了一个多角度人际意义“三成分模式”,探讨了言据性作为一种语篇策略在学术论文中的三种人际功能:作为评价手段的言据性;作为元语篇的言据性;体现作者身份的言据性。并论证了言据性及其词汇语法手段和人际功能之间的双向制约与影响的密切关系;3)通过对言据性在以英语为母语的学术论文和中国研究者英语学术论文中的比较研究说明了不同文化背景下的作者在使用英语言据性进行劝说和论证时存在异同。

本书的第一章是导言,主要介绍了言据性的定义、研究背景、研究方法和章节安

排。言据性的研究虽已很多,但是在言据性的定义上仍没有完全达成共识,因此我们在回顾以往言据性定义的基础上得出了本研究的工作定义,并回顾了以往言据性研究的各种视角,得出了本研究的研究空间和研究重点。该章还对研究方法、语料收集和研究程序做了说明,最后介绍了本书的整体结构。第二章为本书的理论框架部分,介绍与本研究有关的系统功能语言学的几个概念:语类结构、评价理论、元话语理论,最后得出了本研究的一个多角度人际意义“三成分模式”。第三章是语料描述阶段,全面勾画了言据性在英语语言学学术论文中的词汇语法表现和分布规律,说明了言据性与学术论文语类结构之间的密切关系。第四章是语料分析阶段。根据第三章的理论框架,从“作为评价手段的言据性;作为元语篇的言据性;体现作者身份的言据性”三个方面对言据性在学术论文中的人际意义进行了阐释,同时指出言据性及其词汇语法手段与其人际意义之间的双向影响和制约关系。第五章是一个比较研究,通过对言据性在以英语为母语的学术论文和中国研究者英语学术论文中的比较研究说明了不同文化背景下的作者在使用英语言据性进行劝说和论证时存在异同。相同点说明了言据性在学术论文这一语类中的普遍性,不同点则显示了不同文化背景下的作者在使用同一语言表达言据性时会有差异。第六章是全书的结论部分,首先概括了本研究的主要发现,讨论了本书的不足之处以及对进一步研究的思考。本书对言据性在英语语言学学术论文中使用规律的分析以及言据性的多种人际功能的分析意在阐释言据性是一种语篇策略,言据性的使用 and 选择都是为语篇的交际目的服务的,从而达到学术论文劝说和论证的目的。

本书的价值主要概括为以下几点:1)首次勾画出言据性在英语学术论文中使用的全景图,将言据性研究在语类层面上扩展到学术语篇;2)进一步揭示出言据性的人际功能本质,并以系统功能语言学为基础,整合性地提出言据性在英语学术论文中的人际意义;3)对英语学术论文中言据性人际意义的研究框架和方法对其他语类中言据性的研究,尤其是其他学术语篇语类具有借鉴意义;4)对不同文化背景下的英语学术论文中言据性使用的比较研究的结果可以用于指导学术论文的写作和教学,提高论文作者的言据性的功能意识,更好地通过言据性的使用达到学术论文的劝说与论证功能。

由于作者水平有限,书中肯定有疏漏和错误,敬请学界前辈和同仁不吝赐教!

杨林秀

2014年12月

List of abbreviations

RA	research articles
EAP	English for academic purposes
SFL	Systemic Functional Linguistics
NS	Native speakers
GSP	Generic structure potential

Contents

序	i
前言	iii
List of abbreviations.....	v
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 What is evidentiality?	1
1.2 Approaches to evidentiality.....	7
1.2.1 The typological and cross-linguistic approach.....	7
1.2.2 The cognitive approach.....	13
1.2.3 The pragmatic approach	14
1.2.4 Systemic functional linguistics approach.....	16
1.2.5 Other approaches to evidentiality.....	17
1.3 Methodology and data collection	21
1.4 Organization of the book	23
Chapter 2 Toward a three-element model of interpersonal functions of evidentiality in RAs.....	26
2.1 SFL.....	26
2.1.1 Language as social-semiotic and meaning potential	27
2.1.2 Three metafunctions	27
2.1.3 Strata and realization.....	28
2.1.4 Evidentiality in transitivity system.....	30
2.1.5 Evidentiality and modality system in SFL.....	31
2.1.6 Evidentiality and grammatical metaphor.....	34
2.1.7 The appraisal theory	37
2.1.8 The cognitive approach to language in SFL	39
2.2 Genre.....	40
2.2.1 Genre in SFL	40

2.2.2	Swale's and Bhatia's notions of genre	41
2.3	Epistemological stance	43
2.4	Metadiscourse.....	45
2.5	A three-element model of interpersonal functions of evidentiality in RAs	48
2.5.1	RAs as a persuasive and interactive genre	49
2.5.2	Defining the three-element model	50
2.6	Analytical framework in the current research	55
2.7	Summary	57
Chapter 3	Classification and distributions of evidentiality in RAs	58
3.1	Classifications of evidentiality	58
3.1.1	Previous classifications of evidentiality	59
3.1.2	Classification of evidentiality in the current study.....	62
3.2	Lexicogrammatical realizations of evidentiality in RAs.....	67
3.2.1	Identification of evidentials in the data.....	67
3.2.2	Lexicogrammatical realizations of evidential types	69
3.3	Distribution patterns of evidential types in RAs	78
3.3.1	The frequencies of evidential types	78
3.3.2	Distribution of evidentials in different evidential types.....	80
3.4	Evidentiality and generic structure of RAs	82
3.4.1	The generic structure of RAs	82
3.4.2	Relationship between evidential types and generic structure of RAs.....	83
3.5	Summary	88
Chapter 4	Evidential choice and interpersonal functions of evidentiality in RAs	89
4.1	Evidentiality as evaluation.....	89
4.1.1	Evaluative functions of reporting evidentials	90
4.1.2	Evidentiality and modal responsibility in RAs.....	103
4.1.3	Evidentiality and dialogism.....	110
4.2	Evidentiality as metadiscourse.....	123
4.2.1	The interpersonal nature of metadiscourse	124

4.2.2	Evidentiality as textual metadiscourse.....	125
4.2.3	Evidentiality as interpersonal metadiscourse	127
4.2.4	Summary of evidentiality as metadiscourse.....	136
4.3	Evidentiality as writer identity indexing	137
4.3.1	Evidentiality and the writer's credibility	138
4.3.2	Evidentiality and the balance between writer's authority and solidarity	143
4.3.3	Evidentiality and writer's respect and responsibility	146
Chapter 5	A comparative study of evidentiality in RA s of NS and Chinese writers.....	149
5.1	The necessity of a comparative study.....	149
5.2	Findings of the comparative study	150
5.2.1	Similarities found in the comparative study	151
5.2.2	Differences found in the comparative study	154
5.3	Pedagogical implications	157
5.4	Summary	158
Chapter 6	Conclusion.....	160
6.1	A Summay of the findings in this book.....	160
6.2	Significance of the current study	163
6.3	Limitations and suggestions for future research	164
Appendixes		167
Appendix 1	Data sources	167
Appendix 2	Evidentials investigated in the current research.....	171
Appendix 3	Sample of concordance of reporting evidential <i>show</i>	172
Bibliography		173
后记		183

List of Tables

2.1	Modality: examples of 'type' and 'orientation' combined	34
2.2	Examples of three values of modality of probability	34
2.3	An example of metaphor in modality	36
2.4	Vande Kopple's classification system for metadiscourse.....	45
2.5	Crismore et al.'s categorization of metadiscourse (1993: 47-54).....	46
2.6	Hyland's categorization of metadiscourse.....	47
3.1	Lexicogrammatical patterns of evidential types in RAs	78
3.2	Distribution of evidentials of different evidential types in NS corpus.....	80
4.1	Distribution of reporting evidentials in NS corpus.....	91
4.2	Information sources of reporting evidentials in NS corpus	93
4.3	Distribution of the verb groups in reporting evidentials in NS corpus.....	97
4.4	Categories of nouns as evidentials in NS corpus.....	100
4.5	Categories and sample realizations of different degrees of certainty (after the modality system of Halliday).....	107
4.6	Occurrences of different realizations of degrees of certainty in NS corpus...	108
4.7	The monoglossic and the heteroglossic.....	112
4.8	Summary of evidentiality as metadiscourse	136
5.1	Evidential types and generic structures of RAs in the two corpora (with frequency per 1,000 words)	152
5.2	Realizations of evidential types in NS and Chinese corpora	153
5.3	Reporting verbs used in NS and Chinese corpora.....	154

List of Figures

1.1	Palmer's model of propositional modality	5
1.2	Model of epistemological stance adoption (after Mushin, 2001)	13
2.1	Language as a tri-stratal system (after Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999: 5)	29
2.2	Modality types in SFL	32
2.3	Modality system in SFL	33
2.4	Stratified model of genre	41
2.5	Model of evidential choice in the current research	44
2.6	The three-element working model	50
2.7	Analytical framework of evidentiality adopted in the book	56
3.1	Willet's classification of evidentiality	60
3.2	Chafe's model of evidentiality (Chafe, 1986: 263)	60
3.3	Classification of evidentiality in the current study	63
3.4	Distribution of evidential types in NS corpus	79
3.5	Frequency of evidential types in different sections of RAs	84
3.6	Distribution of evidential types in generic structure of RAs	85
3.7	A CARS model for article introduction	86
4.1	Categories of reporting verbs (after Hyland, 1999: 350)	96
4.2	Relationship among certainty, modal responsibility and realizations	109
4.3	System of dialogism	114
4.4	Evidential types and entertain	118
4.5	Distribution of acknowledgement and distancing in other-reporting evidentials	120
4.6	Evidentials as dialogic expansion	120
4.7	Categorization of dialogic contraction (adapted from Martin & White 2005: 134)	121
4.8	Distribution of other-reporting evidentials and self-reporting evidentials as endorsement	122

4.9	Comparison of self-reporting evidentials as boosters and hedges in NS corpus	132
5.1	Frequencies of evidential types in NS and Chinese corpora.....	151
5.2	Evidential types in generic structures of RAs by NS and Chinese writers	152

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 What is evidentiality?

Evidentiality, a pervasive linguistic phenomenon in almost all the languages, has recently been arousing the interest of linguists and has become a hot research topic in linguistics. However, so far there has been no consensus yet on what evidentiality is and what kind of linguistic category it is. The disagreements mainly occur in the following aspects: whether evidentiality is a grammatical category or a semantic one; what the semantic scope of evidentiality is and its place in linguistic study, i.e. its relationship with other linguistic categories, especially its close relationship with modality.

As to the first issue of whether evidentiality is a grammatical category or a semantic one, researches have shown that it is language-specific. In about a quarter of the world's languages, every statement is required to specify the type of source on which it is based—for example, whether the speaker sees it, hears it, infers it from indirect evidence, or learns it from someone else. This linguistic category, whose primary meaning is information source, is called '**evidentiality**'. In Boas' (1938: 133) words, 'while for us definiteness, number, and time are obligatory aspects, we find in another language location near the speaker or someone else, [and] source of information—whether seen, heard, or inferred—as obligatory aspects.'

From Boas' words, we can see that in some languages, evidentiality is an obligatory category. As to the linguistic expression of evidentiality, different languages present different evidential systems. For instance, Tariana, an Arawak language spoken in the multilingual area of the Vaupes in northeast Amazonia, has a quite complex evidential system. In this language, one can not simply say '*Jose*

played football'. Instead, speakers have to specify whether they see the event happen, hear it, or know about it because somebody else tells them, etc. This is achieved through a set of evidential markers fused with tense. Omitting an evidential in Tariana will result in an ungrammatical and highly unnatural sentence. Look at the following examples.

(1a) Juse ifida di-manika-*ka*.

'Jose has played football (we saw it)'

(1b) Juse ifida di-manika-*mahka*.

'Jose has played football (we heard it)'

(1c) Juse ifida di-manika-*nihka*.

'Jose has played football (we infer it from visual evidence)'

(1d) Juse ifida di-manika-*sika*.

'Jose has played football (we assume this on the basis of what we already know)'

(Adapted from Aikhenvald, 2004: 2)

The examples above show that evidentiality is obligatory in the language of Tariana. To mark the information source, some markers are used, such as *ka*, *mahka*, *nihka* and *sika*, and these markers are later termed as *evidentials* or *evidential markers* in evidential studies. These instances also show that in Tariana evidentiality is a grammatical category and it is expressed through affixes or clitics.

However, the grammatical evidential system in Tariana is only one of the understandings of evidentiality and evidentials for if evidentiality is defined from the formal perspective, it seems that evidentiality only occurs in some languages, but not a universal concept. For example, in the languages of English, Chinese, German and so on, there are no grammaticalised evidential systems and in these languages, there are no affixes or clitics to express evidentiality. But this is not to say that in these languages there is no evidentiality. In fact, concerning evidentiality, there has been existing different research orientations. While some linguists still show great enthusiasm for describing the grammatical evidential systems of some languages, more researchers agree that evidentiality is not a grammatical form, but a semantic category. Therefore, the semantics of evidential is universal and exist in almost all

the languages in the world. The differences exist in whether it is obligatory or optional and how the semantics is construed in grammatical, lexical or whatever forms. For example, the language of Japanese presents a quite complex system of evidential coding. It has both grammaticalised and non-grammaticalised evidentials (Mushin, 2001). Unlike Tariana and Japanese, the evidential category in English is not grammaticalised (Lazard, 2001). Yet, English has a rich repertoire of evidential devices (Chafe, 1986). It has a broad range of devices such as verbs, adverbs, adjectives, nouns and so on. According to Chafe (1986: 261), the difference between some Indian languages and English in evidentiality is not a matter of evidential vs. no evidentials. It is partly a question of how evidentiality is expressed: is it by suffixes, adverbs and what?

Studies have also shown that while some linguists still stick to the grammaticalised evidentials and exclude other realization forms of evidentiality, more researchers tend to take evidentiality as a semantic one and study various forms in different languages. In English, if evidentiality is taken as a grammatical category, just as in some Indian languages, it appears unnecessary to study evidentiality, for there seems to be no grammaticalised evidentials. In fact, many researchers have been studying evidentiality in English (e.g. Chafe, 1986; Palmer, 1990, 2001; Mushin, 2000, 2001; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Hu, 1994a, 1994b; Fang, 2005; Tang, 2007; Yang, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015), which shows that the notion of evidentiality as a semantic one has been broadly accepted. This book also takes evidentiality as a semantic notion.

The second issue concerning evidentiality is the semantic scope of evidentiality. It is claimed (Aikhenvald, 2004) that evidentiality is an obligatory grammatical category in the language of Tariana whose primary meaning is to indicate the source of information. This view is considered as the narrower understanding of evidentiality in evidential studies. Busseman (1996: 157), one of the linguists who hold the narrow view on evidentiality, defines evidentiality as “the structural dimension of grammar that codifies the source of information transmitted by a speaker with the aid of various types of constructions”. Aikhenvald (2003: 19) also overtly declares the narrow view of evidentiality. She defines the term ‘evidential-