

LEON EEA UHS
EONW EEM
EVLGGSPH
EAGG SAGGSA
EJSG JYZXFGG JHGG
EASG GHWVC
EG KJ LZ LSGKFGG
GLU GGTZ KJL
EW SFGHKFGS1

应用语言学研究丛书

议论文体中的抽象 实体回指

刘东虹 著



华中师范大学出版社

应用语言学研究丛书

新出图证(鄂)字 10 号

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

议论文体中的抽象实体回指/刘东虹著. —武汉:华中师范大学出版社, 2009. 2

ISBN 978-7-5622-3812-6

I. 议… II. 刘… III. 议论文—文体—研究 IV. H052

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2008)第 177589 号

议论文体中的抽象实体回指

刘东虹著©

责任编辑:廖国春

责任校对:王 炜

封面设计:罗明波

编辑室:文字编辑室

电话:027-67863220

出版发行:华中师范大学出版社

社址:湖北省武汉市珞喻路 152 号

电话:027-67863040(发行部) 027-67861321(邮购)

传真:027-67863291

网址:[http://www. ccnu press. com](http://www.ccnu press. com)

电子信箱:hscbs@public. wh. hb. cn

经销:新华书店湖北发行所

印刷:武汉理工大印刷厂

督印:章光琼

字数:240 千字

开本:880mm×1230mm 1/32

印张:9

版次:2009 年 2 月第 1 版

印次:2009 年 2 月第 1 次印刷

印数:1-1500

定价:23.00 元

欢迎上网查询、购书

敬告读者:欢迎举报盗版,请拨打举报电话 027-67861321

序

目前国内外对于回指的研究主要是名词性回指。不同的研究者从不同的角度对回指现象进行了研究,如句法、语义、语用、认知、心理以及人工智能。句法和语义研究主要集中在回指的句法和语义特征上。语言中的结构制约使得不同类型的名词性词语有不同的句法分布和语义解释。句法和语义研究者总是用简洁精确的形式阐述这些制约规则。此类研究的局限性在于仅仅分析句内回指,而实际上大多数回指表现在句与句之间,即篇章回指。其使用和理解受语用和认知因素的影响。语用和认知研究主要说明回指语类型的选择受篇章条件的制约,可能具有某些特殊的语用含义。这些研究只局限于回指语的使用方面,很少涉及回指语的理解以及语境对回指理解和篇章理解的作用。回指的心理研究和人工智能研究则侧重于回指的理解。

以上这些研究主要针对名词性回指,其研究结果无法适用于命题和概念做先行语的回指,即抽象实体回指。目前对于抽象实体回指的部分现象学者略有局部或零散的提及。如 Chu(1998)区分了广义回指和狭义回指,把动词回指、副词回指和小句回指归入广义回指;许余龙(2002)给回指分类时也提到这种回指;Cornish(1986)和 Webber(1988)也扼要地分析过句子回指;Kamp(1981)的“语篇表征理论(DRT)”从动态的角度研究抽象实体回指中的个别现象。不过这些学者只是在研究具体事物回指时偶尔提及属于抽象实体回指的一些现象,并未对此做过深入系统的研究。当前只有 Asher(1993)提出的“语段表征理论(SDRT)”专门用于抽象实体的回指解决。但

是, Asher 的例子基本上都是为了解释该理论而精心设计的, 而不是从实际语料中提取, 因而缺乏真实性。此外, Asher 研究的仅仅是英语抽象实体回指, SDRT 是否能用于其他语言还有待检验, 而且 Asher 的研究仅局限于回指理解的一个方面——回指解析, 这对于抽象实体回指的研究还远远不够, 其语用功能、语用规律、语篇环境及回指语的选择等回指使用方面, 也很少有人研究。

因此在抽象实体回指的研究领域留下了一块硕大的处女地。刘东虹在攻读博士学位期间, 对英语议论文、说明文和叙事文体(小说)三种文体进行了比较, 发现议论文中抽象实体回指的数量最多, 甚至高于说明文, 而小说最少。这个发现促使她以议论文为语料, 研究抽象实体回指。抽象实体回指作为一种回指现象, 数量并不少, 理应得到足够的重视和充分的研究。

刘东虹的这本专著是在她的博士论文基础上修改而成的。该书的创新之处在于确定了抽象实体回指是一种独立于其他回指的形式。以前的回指研究没有把抽象实体回指区分出来, 只是偶尔提及一带而过。但是本书将这种现象作为一种特殊类别的回指处理, 研究其语用特征及理解规律, 研究方式在采用实证与思辨的有机结合的基础上也有创新, 不仅对英语中的抽象实体回指和具体事物回指进行定性分析与定量分析和比较, 而且对汉语中的回指现象也进行了系统的分析比较, 侧重思辨, 辅以实证, 并基于语料中对 SDRT 理论进行质疑与改进, 提出新的解决办法。以前的回指研究语料大部分是小说和少量新闻报道, 这些属于叙述文体和说明文体, 刘东虹选择的是议论文体, 不但解释了议论文体中特有的回指现象, 还为类似研究增添了语料色彩。

刘东虹在华中师范大学任教十几年来, 一直热衷于语言学与二语习得的研究, 发表了许多学术论文, 这为她后来读博期间的研究打下了坚实的基础。为了进一步提高语言学的素养, 她于 2004 年考入复旦大学外文学院攻读博士学位, 我们因此有了师生缘。她十分珍

惜这次深造的机会,在复旦的三年中,她惜时如金,饱读了大量语言学著作和论文,攻克了一个又一个的难题。在我的印象中,她一直对学术充满了热情和执着,勤奋好学,锲而不舍,无怨无悔地付出了大量心血。三年苦读,终有所成。她的博士论文在双盲评审中获得优秀,答辩委员会也给予了很高的评价。

作为她的导师,我很高兴地看到她的专著得以出版,这毕竟是她厚积薄发的研究成果,是她辛勤劳动、刻苦钻研的产物。我诚挚地希望这本书作为一个良好的开端,会引发她更多、更好的研究成果。

熊学亮

2008年8月8日写于复旦大学

Acknowledgements

This book is heavily based on my dissertation. My deepest gratitude goes first to my supervisor Professor Xiong Xueliang in Fudan University. I'm greatly indebted to his inspiring guidance and valuable suggestions in my dissertation writing. His enlightening talks, lectures and books shed enormous light on me. His devotedness and enthusiasm in linguistic research as well as his humor and optimism in life have great influence on me. I'm sincerely thankful to his support and encouragement throughout my three-year tough and torturing research.

Special thanks go to Professor Qu Weiguo in Fudan University who has generously and kindly offered me some necessary materials for the writing of my dissertation and has put forward beneficial suggestions to revise my dissertation. I'm also greatly obliged to Professor Chu Xiaoquan for his constructive criticisms and insightful comments on the draft of my dissertation.

My sincere thanks extend to Professor Shu Baimei in Central China Normal University for leading me to the field of linguistics during my postgraduate studies. Many thanks are due to Professor Zhang Weiyou, Professor Liao Meizhen, Professor Chen Youlin, Professor Li Yadan and Professor Huang Xiaogun in CCNU who have showed concern to my life and academic work and have given me warm encouragement frequently.

This work has also benefited greatly from the discussions with

my fellow PhD candidates and friends, especially Liu Xiangjun and Weng Yiqin. Thanks also go to Zhou Pin, Teng Mei, Chen Lang, Jiang Fan and other friends, for all the happy hours we share together during the hard time of my dissertation writing. I'm also grateful to my sister Liu Xu, an associate professor who has helped me print the questionnaire and implement the investigation.

I'm greatly indebted to my parents, who are retired professors and shouldered all the responsibility of looking after my son so that I could be concentrated on my PhD work. Whenever I went home with pressure from school they tried to infuse me with courage and confidence. Without my parents' encouragement and support, I would not have been able to overcome the difficulties in my doctoral study. Last but not least, for my husband, Huang Zhengjun, I owe my heartfelt thanks for his unfailing love, considerable support and encouragement.

Contents

序.....	1
Acknowledgements	i
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Definition of Abstract Entity Anaphora	2
1.2 Differences between Abstract Entity Anaphora and Other Kinds of Anaphora	6
1.2.1 Abstract Entity Anaphora and Concrete Individual Anaphora	6
1.2.2 Abstract Entity Anaphora, Extended Reference and Text Reference	8
1.2.3 Abstract Entity Anaphora and Deep Anaphora	9
1.2.4 Abstract Entity Anaphora and Associative Anaphora	10
1.3 The Necessity of the Study of Abstract Entity Anaphora in Argumentative Texts	12
1.3.1 The Limitations of the Previous Study of Abstract Entity Anaphora	12
1.3.2 Characteristics of Argumentative Text	14
1.3.3 Argumentative Text and Abstract Entity Anaphora	15
1.4 Research Purpose and Significance	17
1.5 Organization of the Study	18
Chapter 2 Pragmatic Features of Abstract Entity Anaphora ...	21
2.1 Introduction	21

2.2	The Written Argumentative Data	22
2.2.1	The Sources of the Argumentative Texts	22
2.2.2	The Criteria of Data Collection and the Content of Data Analyses	23
2.2.2.1	The Criteria of the Data Collection	23
2.2.2.1.1	Anaphors	23
2.2.2.1.2	Antecedents	25
2.2.2.2	The Content of Data Analyses	26
2.3	Pragmatic Functions of Abstract Entity Anaphors	27
2.3.1	Recapitulation	27
2.3.2	Obscuration	34
2.3.3	Demarcation	36
2.4	Text Environment of Abstract Entity Anaphora	38
2.4.1	Background	38
2.4.2	Text Environment of English Abstract Entity Anaphora	41
2.4.2.1	Ariel's Work on English Concrete Individual Anaphora	41
2.4.2.2	The Present Study of English Abstract Entity Anaphora	43
2.4.3	Text Environment of Chinese Abstract Entity Anaphora	49
2.4.3.1	The Study of Chinese Concrete Individual Anaphora by 许余龙	49
2.4.3.2	The Present Study of Chinese Abstract Entity Anaphora	50
2.4.4	Comparisons between English and Chinese Abstract Entity Anaphora	52
2.5	Pragmatic Tendency of Abstract Entity Anaphora	53
2.6	Backwards Anaphora	58

2.7 Summary	62
Chapter 3 Discourse Structure and Discourse Anaphora	64
3.1 Introduction	64
3.2 Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) by Mann and Thompson	65
3.2.1 Main Idea	65
3.2.2 Comment	69
3.3 Rhetorical Structure by Fox	70
3.3.1 Main Idea	70
3.3.1.1 Basic Units	70
3.3.1.2 Rhetorical Relations	71
3.3.1.3 Anaphora	72
3.3.2 Comment	75
3.4 Linguistic Discourse Model (LDM) by Polanyi	76
3.4.1 Main Idea	76
3.4.2 Comment	80
3.5 Other Related Studies	83
3.6 Discourse Representation Theory	86
3.6.1 Main Idea	86
3.6.1.1 DRS Construction	86
3.6.1.2 DRT and Anaphora Resolution	89
3.6.2 Comment	91
3.7 Taking Stock	93
Chapter 4 SDRT and Abstract Entity Anaphora	95
4.1 Introduction	95
4.2 Discourse Relations and Topic	96
4.2.1 Discourse Relations	96
4.2.2 Topic	98
4.3 SDRS Construction	100
4.3.1 Determining the Basic Constituents	100

4.3.2	Constraints on Possible Sites for Constituent Attachment	101
4.3.3	SDRS Updating	103
4.3.4	Constituent Revision	107
4.4	SDRT and Abstract Entity Anaphora	110
4.4.1	Constraints on Abstract Entity Anaphora	110
4.4.2	AVAILABILITY and Constituent Revision	114
4.4.2.1	AVAILABILITY and Topic Revision	114
4.4.2.2	AVAILABILITY and Discourse Relation-based Revision	116
4.4.3	More Application to Abstract Entity Anaphora	118
4.4.3.1	Event and Propositional Anaphora	118
4.4.3.2	Concept Anaphora	121
4.4.3.3	Discourse Subordination	124
4.5	Application of SDRT to Chinese Abstract Entity Anaphora	128
4.6	SDRT and Backwards Anaphora	134
4.7	Support from Cognitive Psychology	138
4.7.1	Situation Model	139
4.7.2	Resonance Model	141
4.8	Summary	143
Chapter 5	Inadequacies of SDRT and Suggested Solutions ...	146
5.1	Introduction	146
5.2	Inadequacies	147
5.2.1	Discourse Relations	147
5.2.2	Topic Construction	148
5.2.3	The Role of the Topic	150
5.2.4	Explicit Referent Identification	151
5.2.5	Implicit Referent Identification	152
5.2.6	Reference Ambiguity Resulting from Double Attachment	

Sites	153
5.2.7 Long-distance Anaphora	154
5.3 Suggested Solutions	156
5.3.1 Simplification of the Discourse Relations in SDRT	156
5.3.1.1 Background	156
5.3.1.2 Proposed Categorization	160
5.3.1.3 Effect of the Simplification	164
5.3.2 Topic Construction of Binary Structures	166
5.3.3 Topic Dominating Role	172
5.3.4 Explicit Referent Interpretation	174
5.3.4.1 Semantic Information in Anaphoric Sentence	175
5.3.4.2 Semantic Information in the Sentences before the Anaphoric Sentence	180
5.3.4.3 Semantic Information in the Anaphor	181
5.3.5 Proposition Abstraction for Implicit Referent	183
5.3.5.1 Indirectness, Inference and Proposition Abstraction	184
5.3.5.2 Antecedent Types for Proposition Abstraction	186
5.3.5.3 Triggers for Proposition Abstraction	189
5.4 Summary	190
Chapter 6 Processing of Reference Ambiguity and Long-distance Anaphora	192
6.1 Introduction	192
6.2 Solutions to Reference Ambiguity	193
6.2.1 Context and Intension	193
6.2.2 Tendency Investigation	194
6.2.2.1 Background	195
6.2.2.2 Processing Strategies in Three Types of	

Discourse	197
6. 2. 2. 3 Questionnaire and Procedure	199
6. 2. 2. 4 Results	203
6. 2. 2. 5 Discussion	208
6. 2. 2. 6 Conclusion	211
6. 3 Long-distance Anaphora	211
6. 3. 1 Background	211
6. 3. 2 Theoretical Bases	213
6. 3. 2. 1 Van Dijk's Superstructure	213
6. 3. 2. 2 Van Eemeren et al. 's Argumentation Structures and Reconstruction	215
6. 3. 3 Hypothesis Formulation	218
6. 3. 3. 1 Proposed Superstructure of Argumentative Texts	218
6. 3. 3. 2 Hypothesis about the Resolution of Long-distance Anaphora	220
6. 3. 4 Instances of Application	224
6. 3. 4. 1 Standpoint as the Antecedent	224
6. 3. 4. 2 Question or Background as the Antecedent	227
6. 3. 4. 3 Arguments as the Antecedents	233
6. 3. 5 The Role of Semantic Chains in Referent Interpretation	239
6. 3. 5. 1 The Role of Semantic Chains	239
6. 3. 5. 2 Psychological Warrant	240
6. 4 Summary	242
Chapter 7 Conclusion	245
7. 1 Achievements of This Study	245
7. 2 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	250
Appendix	252
Bibliography	257

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 The Definition of Abstract Entity Anaphora

Abstract entities originally fall into a philosophical category, yet they have linguistic aspects and are discussed by some linguists such as Lyons (1977), Asher (1993), Vendler (1967), Smith (2003) and Peterson (1997). But Lyons' abstract entities correspond only in part to the other linguists'. Lyons classifies entities in the world into three kinds. First-order entities are physical objects that are publicly observable, relatively constant as to their perceptual properties and located in a three-dimensional space. Second-order entities mean events, processes, state-of-affairs etc. that are said to occur or take place rather than to exist. They are observable and have a temporal duration. Third-order entities refer to such abstract entities as propositions which are outside space and time. The abstract entities proposed by Asher et al. cover not only third-order entities but also second-order entities. According to Asher (1993), abstract entities refer to propositions, concepts, facts and events, as can be seen in the following underlined parts.

- (1. 1) John does not believe that [Mary is treating him fairly]_i. But Fred is certain of it_i. (proposition)
(Asher, 1993: 226)

- (1. 2) [Every Swiss farmer who owns a donkey beats it]_i. But **that**_i 's not true of an Austrian farmer and any donkey he owns. (concept) (Asher, 1993: 249)
- (1. 3) [No one heeded the government's curfew orders]_i. **This**_i shows that the Junta can no longer control the people. (fact) (Asher, 1993: 245)
- (1. 4) [The Ashers were predictably short of groceries the day of the party. Nicholas Asher went out to get some, got lost and arrived back only after the party had ended]_i. Because of **this**_i, the committee made sure that the Ashers never gave party for the Society again. (event) (Asher, 1993: 234)

Those abstract entities in the above examples, except events, are pure abstract entities since they "have no spatio-temporal location, usually no causal efficacy and not perceived by the senses" (Asher, 1993: 1). Events, contrarily, have spatio-temporal location as well as causal efficacy. Despite this, events are closely related to abstract entities in that the sentences describing events may express propositions and facts. For example, the antecedent of (1. 4) expresses the proposition "Nicholas failed to supply enough groceries for the party". For that reason, Asher (1993) subsumes events into the category of abstract entities. In the continuum of abstract entities events have the lowest degree of abstractness while propositions the highest degree.

The term "abstract entity anaphora" is initiated by Asher (1993) in his book *Reference to Abstract Objects in Discourse*. It refers to such anaphora whose antecedent is abstract entity. According to Chu (1998), the term "anaphora" is generally used to denote a device to refer back to what has been mentioned

previously. Strictly speaking, the anaphors in most contexts do not actually refer back to the previous expressions themselves, but rather refer to the same entities or concepts that the previous linguistic forms are used to refer to. So it is more accurate to treat anaphors as coreferring with some previous expressions than as referring back to those expressions. As for abstract entity anaphora, the anaphors refer back to the propositions or concepts expressed by the antecedents instead of the linguistic forms of the antecedents (see the above examples). In this sense, abstract entity anaphora is counted as one kind of anaphora. Asher (1993) does not advocate making an accurate differentiation among the types of abstract entity anaphora. He holds the view that abstract entities as the products of the thought of human beings have indefinite and vague limits between the different types. Apart from that, different types of abstract entities such as propositions and facts may be fused to constitute the antecedent, as shown in example(1.5). Moreover, it is hard to differentiate the sentences directly expressing propositions from those conveying facts. For instance in(1.1), if we remove the main clause containing the verb “believe” which typically expresses a proposition, the rest part “Mary is treating him fairly” may either express a proposition or a fact. For the above three reasons, Asher (1993) incorporates fact anaphora into proposition anaphora, which makes up the major type of abstract entity anaphora.

- (1.5) [The fact that Sam ran off with his secretary surprised no one. Mary’s expectation that he would be unfaithful is also a pretty grim commentary on his character]_i. All of it_i makes plain the typical, sad state of modern marriages. (Asher, 1993: 59)