

中国歌谣集成

中国歌谣集成

四川卷·下册

中国民间文学集成全国编辑委员会
《中国歌谣集成·四川卷》编辑委员会

江苏工业学院图书馆
藏书章

中国 I S B N 中心

中国歌谣集成四川卷(上下册)

中国民间文学集成全国编辑委员会

中国歌谣集成四川卷编辑委员会

中国 ISBN 中心出版

新华书店总店北京发行所经销

北京市冠中印刷厂印刷

开本:787×1092 毫米 1/16 印张:98 插页:20 字数:196 万

2004 年 11 月北京第一版 2004 年 11 月北京第一次印刷

印数:1—2000 册

ISBN 7—5076—0231—1/J·222

定价:250(全两册)元

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is a substantially revised version of my 1986 University of Toronto PhD dissertation. In revising it for publication, I have reorganized Chapters 2 and 3, added substantial portions to Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 6, and included a new final chapter, Chapter 7: Implications: the foreground/background distinction.

Many friends and colleagues have contributed to the development of my thesis and this book. I am particularly indebted to Jack Chambers, for his careful attention to all aspects of my work and for his gentle prodding and encouragement during the ambivalent stages of my graduate school career. I thank members of my dissertation committee, Paul Hopper, Debbie James, Ivan Kalmar, Keren Rice, and Ron Wardhaugh, and two anonymous Routledge reviewers for valuable suggestions and advice concerning the revision of my dissertation manuscript. While not directly involved in the writing of my thesis or this book, Carlos Yorio contributed significantly to my intellectual development through his teaching and general enthusiastic encouragement of my work. I only regret that I can no longer thank Carlos in person.

In a less direct way, I am indebted to Ann Banfield, Helen Dry, and Tanya Reinhart. Their influence on the ideas presented in this book is profound and I can only apologize if I have managed to misrepresent their work in any way.

I am grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for doctoral fellowships during the writing of my dissertation and to the Faculty of Arts, York University, for a research grant that provided funding during the final stages of revision. I acknowledge with thanks permission granted by Mouton de Gruyter and Pergamon Press to reprint portions of my articles

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

‘Aspect, foregrounding and point of view’ (*Text* 7–4, 1987) and ‘Cohesive devices and discourse competence’ (*World Englishes* 7–2, 1988). Extracts from *Mrs Dalloway* and *To the Lighthouse* are reproduced by kind permission of the Executors of the Virginia Woolf Estate, the Hogarth Press, and Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Finally, I thank Peter Avery, who made me feel that I wasn’t working in a vacuum, and Bernie Frohmann, for his intellectual clarity and his never-failing encouragement during the various stages of preparation of this work.

Susan Ehrlich
Toronto, Canada

CONTENTS

	<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
	<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
	<i>Introduction</i>	1
1	SENTENCE-BASED APPROACHES TO POINT OF VIEW	4
	<i>Introduction</i>	4
	<i>General description</i>	6
	<i>Limitations of sentence-based approaches to RST</i>	17
	<i>RST/narration and foreground/background</i>	25
2	COHESION, COHERENCE, AND EPISODES	27
	<i>Introduction</i>	27
	<i>Coherence</i>	28
	<i>Explicit coherence: cohesion</i>	30
	<i>Summary</i>	39
3	REFERENTIAL AND SEMANTIC CONNECTOR LINKING	40
	<i>Introduction</i>	40
	<i>Dominance and sentences containing parentheticals</i>	41
	<i>Cohesion and sentences containing parentheticals</i>	48
	<i>Demarcation of discourse units</i>	56
	<i>Summary</i>	57

4	TEMPORAL LINKING	58
	<i>Introduction</i>	58
	<i>Temporal linking as a cohesive device</i>	59
	<i>Interpretation of temporal expressions</i>	60
	<i>Temporal interpretation of sentences of RST</i>	64
	<i>Anchoring predicates</i>	74
	<i>Demarcation of discourse units</i>	78
	<i>Summary</i>	80
5	ASPECT, COHERENCE, AND POINT OF VIEW	81
	<i>Introduction</i>	81
	<i>Past progressive and point of view</i>	83
	<i>Progressive vs simple aspect</i>	87
	<i>Progressive in other contexts</i>	92
	<i>Conclusion</i>	93
6	CONCLUSIONS	95
	<i>Introduction</i>	95
	<i>Summary: cohesion, coherence, and RST</i>	95
	<i>Summary: demarcation of RST units</i>	99
	<i>Function of RST inter-sentential devices</i>	101
7	IMPLICATIONS: THE FOREGROUND/BACKGROUND DISTINCTION	106
	<i>Introduction</i>	106
	<i>The foreground/background distinction</i>	106
	<i>Narration/RST and foreground/background</i>	110
	<i>Linguistic correlates of foreground and background material</i>	115
	<i>Notes</i>	118
	<i>References</i>	125
	<i>Subject index</i>	130
	<i>Author index</i>	132

INTRODUCTION

Of increasing interest in text linguistics and discourse analysis is the identification of linguistic properties of narrative texts responsible for their temporal organization. Labov (1972) defines a minimal narrative text as one containing at least two temporally ordered clauses (what he terms 'narrative clauses') in which the events are presented in an order that matches their occurrence in the depicted world. In addition, these temporally ordered clauses must have the effect of moving time forward in the depicted world in order to meet Labov's condition on narrativity. Labov and others have investigated the particular linguistic features that serve to signal narrative clauses or (what has also been called) the 'foreground' of a narrative. Most investigations of foreground have involved the analysis of relatively simple texts, usually short oral narratives representing events from a single viewpoint. This study departs from such studies in analysing literary narratives conveyed from a multiplicity of perspectives.

Modern literary narratives, like modern paintings, are often represented from different viewing positions. In the case of a painting, the differing viewpoints will vary in terms of spatial position; in the case of a narrative, the differing viewpoints may vary both spatially and temporally. The texts investigated in this study are narratives characterized by frequent shifts in the spatial and temporal positions from which events and descriptions are related. The examples that constitute the data-base of this book come from two novels by Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse* and *Mrs Dalloway*. Auerbach (1968) makes the following comments regarding the multiplicity of perspectives, emblematic of Woolf's style:

POINT OF VIEW

The essential characteristic of the technique represented by Virginia Woolf is that we are given not merely one person whose consciousness (that is, the impressions it receives) is rendered, but many persons, with frequent shifts from one to another. . . . The design of a close approach to objective reality by means of numerous subjective impressions received by various individuals (and at various times) is important in the modern technique which we are examining. It basically differentiates it from the unipersonal subjectivism which allows only a single and generally a very unusual person to make himself heard and admits only that one person's way of looking at reality.

(Auerbach 1968: 536)

As a discourse analysis of two literary texts, this book is necessarily interdisciplinary. Its purpose is twofold. From the perspective of linguistics, it seeks to analyse the discourse structure of texts with a complex temporal organization. From the perspective of literary studies, it seeks to explain certain non-linguistic aspects of the texts, i.e. point of view, in terms of linguistic form. This book, then, extends the domain of discourse analysis to include the language of complex literary texts and, at the same time, offers a descriptively adequate account of the relationship between linguistic form and point of view. Inasmuch as the central aim of this study is to make explicit the linguistic clues that readers use in identifying point of view, my goal is *not* to provide new 'readings' of the texts under investigation. Because point of view interpretations do not differ radically from reader to reader, the analysis of point of view in literary narratives constitutes a natural intersection for the disciplines of linguistics and literary studies. By focusing on the formal linguistic properties of literary texts, I do not offer new interpretations of these texts but rather attempt to *explain* readers' interpretations of certain aspects of the texts (i.e. point of view).

The book is organized as follows. Chapter 1 demonstrates the limitations of previous linguistic accounts of point of view, arguing that reference to discourse properties of texts is essential to a more satisfactory account. Chapter 2 describes my linguistic framework for cohesion and coherence. Chapters 3 and 4 show that the interpretation of point of view is related to three discourse conditions of cohesion: referential linking, semantic connector linking, and temporal linking. In Chapter 5, I demonstrate the relationship

INTRODUCTION

between aspectual distinctions and coherence, on the one hand, and the interpretation of point of view, on the other. Chapter 6 summarizes the major points made in previous chapters by analysing several extended pieces of text, and then considers the literary function of linguistic correlates of point of view above the level of the sentence. In Chapter 7, I discuss the implications of my analysis for linguistic studies of foreground and background.

Within the framework developed in this book, sentences that are locally cohesive and/or coherent with previous discourse are shown to be interpreted in a similar fashion in terms of point of view. Conversely, sentences that lack local cohesion and/or coherence with previous discourse are shown to be interpreted differently in terms of point of view. The analysis has implications for recent work in discourse analysis concerned with the temporal organization of narrative texts. Such investigations have attempted to isolate the linguistic features of texts that correlate with foreground and background material (i.e. linguistic material that serves to move a narrative through time as opposed to linguistic material that serves to elaborate upon and embellish the main story line of a narrative). This book demonstrates that the simple binary distinction between foreground and background is not completely adequate for describing texts conveyed from multiple points of view. Texts such as these must be viewed as containing foreground and background material represented from various viewpoints. In addition, it is demonstrated that 'traditional' correlates of foreground and background, such as the perfective/imperfective aspectual alternation, cannot be explained exclusively in terms of these discourse functions.

Throughout the book, references to primary novels are cited by title and page: for example, *To the Lighthouse*, 86–9, and *Mrs Dalloway*, 202. The editions are those of the Hogarth Press reprinted by Penguin books. Occasionally, cited texts and variants of texts are accompanied by marks indicating either grammaticality or pragmatic judgements. The symbol '*' in a single-sentence example indicates ungrammaticality and within a context indicates pragmatic inappropriateness. The symbol '#' indicates semantic deviance. Italicized phrases and clauses in the cited texts are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

SENTENCE-BASED APPROACHES TO POINT OF VIEW

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The question of whose point of view a speaker/writer adopts in describing events within a narrative has been the subject of much study in the field of literary criticism.¹ In recent years, it has received attention from linguists who have argued that linguistic form contributes to the apprehension of point of view. That is, a reader/listener will interpret an utterance or discourse as reflecting a particular point of view, in part, because of the linguistic form of that utterance or discourse. Kuno and Kaburaki (1975), for example, show how certain formal properties of a sentence can affect its interpretation in terms of point of view. Sentences with the same propositional content, like those in (1) below, differ with respect to what Kuno and Kaburaki call 'camera angles'.

- (1) a. John hit Mary.
- b. John hit his wife.
- c. Mary's husband hit her.

In (1a), the event in question is presented objectively by the speaker; the camera can be said to be placed at some point equi-distant from both John and Mary. In (1b), the speaker describes the event from John's point of view, and in (1c) from Mary's point of view. In (1b), Kuno and Kaburaki claim that the camera is placed closer to John in viewing the event and in (1c) that the camera is placed closer to Mary. What is crucial to notice is that the linguistic form of these sentences determines these differing interpretations.

Building on the work of Kuno and Kaburaki, Kuno (1987) substitutes the term 'empathy' for the notion of 'camera angle', defining empathy as 'the speaker's identification, which may vary in degree,

with a person/thing that participates in the event or state that he describes in a sentence' (Kuno 1987:206). For Kuno, syntactic constructions differ to the extent that they convey a speaker's empathy. A passive sentence like *Bill was hit by his brother*, for example, is said to convey a speaker's closer identification with *Bill* than with John (the referent of *his brother*). On the other hand, the active sentence *John hit his brother* is said to convey the opposite empathy perspective. (These interpretations are also a result of the possessive NPs, which indicate that the speaker is closer to the referent of the possessor than to that of the entire NP.)

While Kuno distinguishes between the linguistic correlates of partial and total identification of the speaker with a person or character being described, he points out that the latter perspective seldom occurs in conversation but readily occurs in narratives. Kuroda (1973), for example, identifies a narrative style in Japanese (what he calls a non-reportive style) where, in Kuno's terms, the narrator (speaker) totally identifies with the characters involved in the described events. Of linguistic interest within this style is the co-occurrence of sensation adjectives, normally predicated of first-person subjects, with third-person subjects. Because the sensation adjectives in question can represent only a speaker's *experiencing* of sensations or emotions, their occurrence with third-person subjects serves to invoke the third person's point of view. (Thus, in Kuno's terms, the narrator (speaker) totally identifies with the third person.)

Kuroda's non-reportive style has an English counterpart in what has been termed free, indirect style.² Like the non-reportive style of Japanese, free, indirect style often exhibits the narrator's (speaker's) total identification with characters. That is, the subjective points of view of third-person subjects often emerge within texts characterized by free, indirect style. Several linguistic treatments (Banfield 1973, 1978, 1981, 1982; Fillmore 1981; Dry 1975, 1977) of this style have attempted to describe the causal relationship that exists between certain linguistic phenomena and the interpretation of point of view. While these studies have gone a long way in establishing the linguistic correlates of point of view, it is my contention that they have not been completely adequate in accounting for point of view in free, indirect style because they are sentence-based analyses. In this chapter, I point out some of the limitations of a strictly syntactic account of point of view and suggest that an analysis that goes beyond the level of the sentence is a more descriptively adequate one. In the sections that follow, I present a general description of free, indirect style (exemplified

by passages from Woolf), a discussion of the limitations of previous linguistic treatments, and a discussion of the style in relation to the discourse notions of foreground and background.

1.1 GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Following Banfield, I will refer to the literary style under discussion as represented speech and thought (hereafter RST). The formal distinctiveness of this style lies in its blurring of the distinction between direct and indirect discourse. While displaying many of the features of direct discourse, the sentences of RST maintain the pronominal reference and the sequence of tense that characterizes indirect discourse.

Traditionally such texts have been classified as 'third-person narratives' because the narrator or formal speaker of the discourse never speaks of himself/herself but rather of characters designated by third-person pronouns. In such texts, then, there is an absence of first-person pronouns which designate the formal speaker of the discourse. 'Third-person narratives' have traditionally been distinguished from 'first-person narratives' in that the latter do contain 'first-person pronouns which refer to the narrator/formal speaker of the discourse. In fact, the terms 'third-person narrative' and 'first-person narrative' are misnomers, as they imply the complete absence of first-person pronouns within 'third-person narratives'. It is possible for texts traditionally labelled as 'third-person narratives' to contain first-person pronouns in direct discourse where the first-person pronoun refers to a character in the text. Tamir (1976) suggests replacing the inadequate terminology 'first and third-person narration' by personal and impersonal discourse, respectively. If the narrator/formal speaker of a text refers to himself/herself (i.e. if the narrator is a participant in the events he/she is narrating), then the text is considered to be personal discourse, according to Tamir. If, on the other hand, the narrator/formal speaker does not refer to himself/herself in the discourse, then the text is considered to be impersonal discourse.

In RST, the narrator/formal speaker does not speak of himself/herself but rather reports on the activities, thoughts, and speech of characters in the fictional world. What distinguishes RST from other styles of impersonal discourse is the fact that many direct discourse constructions appear in the reporting (i.e. indirect discourse) of characters' thoughts and speech. In other words, rather than reporting the thoughts and/or speech of characters from an

objective perspective, the narrator reports them almost as they are spoken or thought by the characters themselves. In Kuno's terms, the narrator totally identifies with a character in viewing the events of the narrative.

The effect of the mixture of direct and indirect discourse in texts characterized by RST is the emergence of points of view that do not always correspond to the point of view of the narrator of the discourse (i.e. a point of view where the speaker is equi-distant from all characters). This is impersonal discourse, then, because the narrator never speaks of himself/herself; however, this is impersonal discourse in which the personal perspectives of characters can be discerned. Auerbach (1968) has called RST and Woolf's prose, in particular, 'a multi-personal representation of consciousness' because the events of the narrative are conveyed from the perspective of many different characters within the fictional world as well as of the narrator.

Consider the RST passage below from *To the Lighthouse* which illustrates the mixture of direct and indirect discourse. Notice, especially, that two formal properties of indirect discourse – concordance of grammatical person and concordance of tense – are evident. The sentences are indexed [a], [b], etc. for ease of reference.

- (2) [a] Wasn't it late? she asked. [b] They hadn't come home yet. [c] He flicked his watch carelessly open. [d] But it was only just past seven. [e] He held his watch open for a moment, deciding that he would tell her what he had felt on the terrace. [f] To begin with, it was not reasonable to be so nervous. [g] Andrew could look after himself. [h] Then, he wanted to tell her that when he was walking on the terrace just now – here he became uncomfortable, as if he were breaking into that solitude, that aloofness, that remoteness of hers. . . . [i] But she pressed him. [j] What had he wanted to tell her, she asked, thinking it was about going to the Lighthouse; and that he was sorry he had said 'Damn you'. [k] But no. [l] He did not like to see her look so sad, he said. [m] Only wool gathering, she protested, flushing a little.

(*To the Lighthouse*, 78–9)

Concordance of grammatical person is exemplified in sentence [l] where the referent, Mr Ramsay, is designated by a third-person pronoun in both the main and embedded clauses: *He did not like to see her look so sad, he said*. Direct discourse requires no

such concordance of grammatical person as it reports actual speech events. For example, the direct discourse counterpart of [l] might be: 'I don't like to see you look so sad,' he said. Thus, in direct discourse co-referential NPs are always designated by different person pronouns ('I' and 'he', in this example) in the main and embedded clauses.

Concordance of tense is exemplified in sentence [j]: *What had he wanted to tell her, she asked*. The verb of the embedded clause (past perfect) differs in tense from the verb of the speech event (simple past). In the direct discourse counterpart of [j], 'What did you want to tell me,' she asked, both verbs are in the simple past. In sentence [j], the verb of the embedded clause has been back-shifted to past perfect in order to agree with the past tense of the narrative timeline.

While this passage displays these two formal markers of indirect discourse, it also contains formal features of direct discourse. Sentence [j] contains an inverted question, a syntactic structure ordinarily restricted to direct discourse as indicated by the ungrammaticality of (3):

- (3) *She asked what had he wanted to tell her.³

Inverted questions are, of course, permissible in direct discourse as direct discourse reports the actual words a speaker utters. Sentence [m] exemplifies another construction normally restricted to direct discourse, an incomplete sentence (*Only wool gathering, she protested*). The indirect discourse counterpart would be the ungrammatical sentence:

- (4) *She protested (that) only wool gathering.

Other syntactic structures of direct discourse can be found in the passages below. (Notice that both of these passages show concordance of grammatical person and tense.)

- (5) He was really, Lily Briscoe thought, in spite of his eyes, but then look at his nose, look at his hands, the most uncharming human being she had ever met.

(*To the Lighthouse*, 99)

- (6) What he would have liked, she supposed, would have been to say how he had been to Ibsen with the Ramsays. He was an awful prig – oh yes, an insufferable bore. For, though they had reached the town now and were in the

main street, with carts grinding past on the cobbles, still he went on talking, about settlements, and teaching, and working men, and helping our own class, and lectures till she gathered that he had got back entire self-confidence, had recovered from the circus. . . .

(*To the Lighthouse*, 15–16)

In (5), the exclamatory sentence, *but then look at his nose, look at his hands*, occurs in the reporting of Lily's thought. This type of expression is normally excluded from indirect discourse, as exemplified by (7):

- (7) *Lily Briscoe thought (that) but then look at his nose, look at his hands.

Passage (8) contains another exclamation, *oh yes, an insufferable bore*, which can only be attributed to Mrs Ramsay's consciousness even though it is not directly embedded under a higher verb of speech or thought. Again, notice that such exclamations are ordinarily excluded from indirect discourse.

- (8) *She thought (that) he was an awful prig – oh yes, an insufferable bore.

In attempting to characterize the effect of interspersing direct discourse constructions within the broader context of indirect discourse, it may be useful to invoke Genette's distinction between 'who sees' and 'who speaks' within a narrative (Genette 1980). The 'speaker' in the examples above is not necessarily the same person who orients the narrative perspective in terms of point of view. For example, the person whose perspective is evident in a sentence like, *He was an awful prig – oh yes, an insufferable bore*, is not the narrator of the text but one of the characters, Mrs Ramsay. Her point of view orients the above sentence, yet she is not the formal speaker of this sentence, as indicated by the back-shifted tense (*was*) and the surrounding sentences in which she is designated by third-person pronouns rather than first-person pronouns.

Passages of RST often include sentences in which the person 'who speaks' and the person 'who sees' are different. On the one hand, features of indirect discourse create a formal 'speaker' who is distinct from any of the characters within the text. On the other hand, features of direct discourse create a point of view that can only be attributed to one of the characters. Several literary critics have described

the function of this style as one in which a character's speech and thoughts are not just reported, but rather rendered almost verbatim (Dillon and Kirchhoff 1976; Leech and Short 1981). The narrator in these texts, implied by means of the presence of formal properties of indirect discourse, is always an intermediary between the reader and the characters' speech and thought; thus, critics perceive the style as almost rendering verbatim the speech and thoughts of characters. Rimmon-Kenan (1983) emphasizes the 'double-edged' effect of the style. While the presence of a 'speaker' distinct from the characters 'may create an ironic distancing', the direct discourse characteristics of the style 'may promote an empathetic identification on the part of the reader' (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 114).

It should be noted at this point that while I adopt Banfield's term, represented speech and thought (RST), to describe the portions of text where the subjective impressions of characters emerge, I take a different approach from Banfield concerning the question of narrator in these texts. One of the major points of Banfield's (1973, 1978, 1981, 1982) work involves the appropriateness of the communication model as a theory of narrative. Following Hamburger (1973) and Kuroda (1973), Banfield argues that 'a text without the first-person pronoun (outside direct speech) or without any linguistic signs of the speaker . . . has no narrator' (Banfield 1973:34-5). More specifically, the sentences of RST are said to be 'speakerless' because they exhibit no overt evidence of the speech event. That is, the formal speaker or narrator of such sentences never refers to himself/herself as *I*, and the addressee of the speech event, *you*, is never mentioned. Following Tamir (1976), my own approach to this question is functional rather than ontological. The texts under investigation here are impersonal in Tamir's sense because there is no evidence of the speech event. I take this to mean, however, not that the narrator does not 'exist' but rather that there is a 'speaking voice,' distinct from any characters, whose role is minimal or 'negligible' (Genette 1980) in the narration.⁴ In contrast to this kind of impersonal discourse is personal discourse (Tamir 1976), where the narrator or 'speaking voice' plays an active role in the narrative events, either by pronouncing explicit judgements upon them or by entering into them. My approach to this issue is consistent with Kuno's approach to point of view or empathy whereby a *speaker* identifies to a greater or lesser degree with the characters of the narrated events.⁵