

求索 外语学术研究系列·博士文库
ACADEMIC SERIES ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDIES

PRAGMATIC AND COGNITIVE STUDIES OF LINGUISTIC PHENOMENA

语言语用及认知研究

刘国辉等 著



重庆大学出版社
<http://www.cqup.com.cn>

内 容 提 要

正如维特根斯坦所言,语言是一种“游戏”,但这种“游戏”背后是有隐含规则或规律的,这就需要去认真探讨和研究。本书从语用、认知视角对一些语言现象,如英汉请求回应、英汉中动结构、英汉名词性领属结构、“Ulysses”象似性和英汉时间隐喻进行了多角度考察。该研究对语言研究者或爱好者有较高的学术参考价值与实用价值。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语言语用及认知研究/刘国辉等著. —重庆:重庆大学出版社,2007.9

(求索外语学术研究系列. 博士文库)

ISBN 978-7-5624-4241-7

I. 语… II. 刘… III. 英语—对比语言学—汉语 IV. H31
H1

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2007)第 123402 号

语言语用及认知研究

刘国辉 等 著

责任编辑:韩 鹏 版式设计:韩 鹏

责任校对:谢 芳 责任印制:赵 晟

*

重庆大学出版社出版发行

出版人:张鸽盛

社址:重庆市沙坪坝正街 174 号重庆大学(A区)内

邮编:400030

电话:(023) 65102378 65105781

传真:(023) 65103686 65105565

网址: <http://www.cqup.com.cn>

邮箱: fxk@cqup.com.cn (市场营销部)

全国新华书店经销

重庆华林天美印务有限公司印刷

*

开本:880×1230 1/32 印张:9.25 字数:275 千

2007年9月第1版 2007年9月第1次印刷

印数:1—2 000

ISBN 978-7-5624-4241-7 定价:25.00 元

本书如有印刷、装订等质量问题,本社负责调换

版权所有,请勿擅自翻印和用本书

制作各类出版物及配套用书,违者必究

作者简介:

刘国辉,重庆大学外国语学院教授(博士),副院长,重庆市语言认知及语言应用研究基地专职研究员,研究生导师,副博导,重庆市外文学会理事,中国认知语言学会常务理事,中国高校功能语言学学会理事,重庆大学民革主委。2003年6月毕业于复旦大学外文学院,获文学博士学位。主要从事理论语言学研究。近年来已在《外语教学与研究》和《外国语》等专业学术刊物上公开发表学术论文近40篇,出版学术专著4部,其中《当代语言理论与实践探索》(1999),2001年获四川省政府三等奖,《英汉请求策略理论与实证对比研究——礼貌语用学视野》(2007)获专家好评。2005年获得重庆市高等学校优秀中青年骨干教师第二批资助计划,2006年被评为重庆大学“优秀教师”。

序 言

当代语言学,如果说从乔姆斯基时代算起的话,到现在半个世纪了。在这期间语言学研究之兴盛,不管是从学派、思潮上看,还是从人数、研究成果上看,都是历史上很少见的,也许是过去几百年的总和,因为这期间出现了很多具有全球影响的世界级大师,如 Chomsky, Halliday, Hymes, Levinson, Leech, Lakoff, Langacker, Talmy, Taylor, Goldberg 等等。各种学术派别或学术思潮,如生成句法学、生成语义学、语用学、社会语言学、系统功能语言学和认知语言学等相继诞生,的确让人眼花缭乱,目不暇接。这一方面说明人们对语言观察和研究的深入,另一方面说明当前信息时代对语言研究有着特殊的需求和要求,特别是机器翻译、人机对话等更离不开语言处理。

然而不管是哪个派别或学者,对语言的处理与研究都离不开一个“自然真实性”,因为这样的语料才可靠,才是真正的语言。也就是说,“真实的语言交际”离不开三个基本条件:一个是物理语境,一个是认知语境,还有一个是社会的人。为什么会这样呢?众所周知,一方面,我们的任何交际都需注意:(i)时间;(ii)空间;(iii)对象;(iv)相互关系;(v)交际方式和(vi)交际目的或意图等参数的变化,否则交际就达不到预期的目标,甚至会失败。另一方面,我们又要尽其所能将客观世界全部描述出来,做到100%的“全真”象似度,但实际上做不到,同时也不必要,因为这样既不经济、省力,又不现实。为此,要想使“有限符号达到无限使用”之目的,我们只好走另一条路——隐喻式扩展,以解决现实需求。我们在此所涉及的五个课题就是自然语言所涉及三个条件的一个初步展示、观察与分析:(i)英汉请求回应对比研究(由刘国辉执笔);(ii)英汉中动结构认知语义对比研究(由戴婷婷执笔);(iii)英汉名词性领属结构认知对比研究(由王君执笔);(iv)“Ulysses”象似性研究(由蒋艳执笔)和(v)英汉时间隐喻认知对比研究(由陆建茹执笔)。最后,由刘国辉进行调整、修改、统稿并编辑而成。

最后,非常感谢重庆大学外国语学院和重庆大学出版社的大力支持,这样才有了该成果问世。

刘国辉

2007年5月

Contents

Chapter One A Contrastive Study of Responses to Requests in English and Chinese	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Subjects	7
1.3 The Questionnaire	8
1.4 Instrument — The Discourse Completion Test	9
1.5 Quantitative Findings Concerning Request Responses among Americans and the Chinese People	10
1.6 Contextual Variables in the Responses to Requests	13
1.7 Tentative Analysis of the Common Features of Request Responses	23
1.8 Limitations and Further Research	27
1.9 Conclusions	27
 Chapter Two Middle Construction in English and Chinese: A Cognitive Semantic Study	 32
2.1 Introduction	33
2.1.1 Orientation and Motivation of the Study	33
2.1.2 The Concept of Middle Construction	34
2.1.3 Aims and Hypotheses of the Study	34
2.1.4 Layout and Scope of the Study	35
2.2 Literature Review	36
2.2.1 Middle Construction	36

2.2.2 Construction Grammar	46
2.3 Middle Construction in English	53
2.3.1 Classification of Middle Construction in English	53
2.3.2 Characteristics of Middle Construction in English	56
2.4 Middle Construction in Chinese	74
2.4.1 Middle Construction in Chinese	74
2.4.2 The Classification of Chinese Middle Construction	77
2.4.3 The Characteristics of Chinese Middle Construction	78
2.4.4 The Selectional Restriction of Middle Verbs in Chinese	82
2.4.5 Particularity of Chinese Middle Construction	83
2.5 Conclusions	86
2.5.1 Findings of the Study	86
2.5.2 Limitations of the Study	87
2.5.3 Suggestions for Further Research	88

Chapter Three A Comparison of Nominal Possessives in English and Chinese from a Cognitive Perspective

3.1 Introduction	90
3.1.1 Orientation of the Title	90
3.1.2 The Significance of the Present Study	90
3.1.3 Methods	92
3.1.4 The Aims of the Present Study	92
3.1.5 Layout and Scope of the Study	93
3.2 Literature Review	93
3.2.1 Traditional Grammar	94
3.2.2 Transformational and Generative Grammar	96
3.2.3 Cognitive Linguistics	103
3.3 Concepts of Possession	107

3.3.1	Definition of Possession	107
3.3.2	Classification of Possession	108
3.3.3	Possessive Morphemes	111
3.4	A Cognitive Approach	116
3.4.1	Possessor as Reference Point	117
3.4.2	Possessor Specification and Possessee Specification	127
3.4.3	Possessive Prototypes	133
3.4.4	From Iconicity to Possessive Constructions	142
3.5	Conclusions	147
 Chapter Four Iconicity in <i>Ulysses</i>		151
4.1	Introduction	152
4.1.1	Motivation of the Present Study	152
4.1.2	The Concept and Criteria of Iconicity	154
4.1.3	The Nature of the Study and Iconicity	155
4.1.4	Methods	156
4.1.5	The Aims and Hypotheses of the Present Study	156
4.1.6	Layout and Scope of the Study	157
4.2	Literature Review	158
4.2.1	Introduction	158
4.2.2	Iconicity Studies in Language	159
4.2.3	Literature Review of the Stream of Consciousness Novel Studies	165
4.2.4	Summary	169
4.3	The Application of Iconicity in <i>Ulysses</i>	169
4.3.1	Introduction	169
4.3.2	From the Phonological View	170
4.3.3	From the Morphological View	173

4.3.4	From the Syntactic View	178
4.3.5	From the Textual View	198
4.4	Contrastive Analysis	200
4.4.1	The Differences and Similarities of Iconicity between <i>Ulysses</i> and Other Streams of Consciousness Novels in Western Culture	200
4.4.2	The Differences and Similarities of Iconicity Studies in the Stream of Consciousness Novels between Western and Eastern Culture	204
4.5	Conclusions	205
4.5.1	Findings	205
4.5.2	Limitations of the Study	206
4.5.3	Suggestions for Further Studies in This Field	207

Chapter Five A Cognitive Approach to Temporal Metaphors in English and Chinese

5.1	Introduction	209
5.1.1	The Basic Concepts	209
5.1.2	Orientation of the Title	212
5.1.3	Motivations of the Study	213
5.1.4	The Aims and Hypotheses of the Present Study	215
5.1.5	Basic Approaches to the Present Study	216
5.1.6	Layout and Scope of the Study	217
5.1.7	Summary	218
5.2	Literature Review	218
5.2.1	Literature Review of Metaphor Studies in the West and China	218
5.2.2	Theoretical Background of Temporal Metaphor	222

5.2.3 Literature Review of Temporal Metaphor Studies in English and Chinese	234
5.2.4 Summary	236
5.3 A Contrastive Study of Temporal Metaphors in English and Chinese	237
5.3.1 Classification of Temporal Metaphors	237
5.3.2 Similarities between Temporal Metaphors in English and Chinese	239
5.3.3 Motivations for the Similarities Between Temporal Metaphors in English and Chinese	254
5.3.4 Differences Between Temporal Metaphors in English and Chinese	255
5.3.5 Motivations for the Differences Between Temporal Metaphors in English and Chinese	262
5.3.6 Special Temporal Metaphors in Chinese	262
5.3.7 Summary	263
5.4 The Application of the Present Study to Foreign Language Teaching	265
5.4.1 Guides for Foreign Language Teaching	266
5.4.2 Contrastive Study for Foreign Language Teaching	266
5.5 Conclusions	268
5.5.1 Major Findings	268
5.5.2 Speculations about the Future Studies of Temporal Metaphors	270
References	271





Chapter One

A Contrastive Study of Responses to Requests in English and Chinese

该研究共有三组被试参加了调查(合计 324 人):他们分别是美语组(美国人),语际组(外语组)和汉语组(中国人)。问卷以英汉两种形式提供,英语问卷供美语组和语际组使用,汉语问卷供汉语组使用。为了调查的有效性,我们根据以往研究的情境模式选择了 12 个情境,这些情境包括了现实交际中所有的社会关系参数或变量,如社会距离、控制(权势)、年龄、性别等等。另外,该研究利用会话完形测试(DCT)这个工具来从被试中获取有关他们表达请求能力的信息。该测试模式是由 Levenston (1975)首先提出来的,主要用来测试当时到加拿大的成人移民的口语水平。它主要有以下优点(Wolfson, et al. 1989: 183-184):(1)可以快速收集大量材料;(2)对自然语言中的语义模式和策略进行了初始分类;(3)提供了社会认可的合适反应的典型框架。结果发现,就请求行为的回应而言,在与不熟悉的陌生人之间交际时,美语组多用积极回应,而汉语组则刚好相反。然而在熟人之间,汉语组则多用积极回应,可美语组并非这样。不管是陌生人还是熟人,语际组始终处于前面两个语组之间。关于英汉两种语言请求回应策略的差异的主要动因,我们认为是个体主义与集体主义,内群体与外群体观念的差异。从个体主义角度看,面子在很大程度上是个人的事。但若从集体主义角度看,个人的面子就是个人所属群体的事,不管这个群体是个人所属的家庭、文化群体还是公司,都可能采取特殊的话语形式来保持内群体与外群体间的界线。


1.1 Introduction

The description of the response to a speech act like request is equally significant because it is an integral part of a speech act and the responses of utterances based on the real life observations are not likely to be neglected. This paper is intended to describe and explain the common and different responses to requests employed in both English and Chinese in a contrastive approach, which is based on the questionnaire survey of Americans and the Chinese people. Through our study we find that in responding to requests, most of the subjects would like to offer positive rather than negative responses. The chief motivation may result from the instinctive altruism and cooperation of human beings. Meanwhile the CHN group prefers the pattern $A > B > C$ for positive responses and $C > B > A$ for negative responses, viz, when Chinese people use positive responses, they like to be terse and when they have to give negative responses, they often say much more about the reasons concerned. However, the AM group prefers the pattern $C > B > A$ for both positive and negative responses, which perhaps is why Americans are talkative, enjoying social interaction. Furthermore, in terms of social distance like among strangers, the AM group prefers positive to negative responses while the CHN group goes to the contrary in most cases.

Hancher (1979) argues that with invitations, bets and offers, the speech act is "incomplete" until the addressee acknowledges and accepts the speaker's offer. For requests, the more emphatically the speaker expresses the certainty of the proposition, the more likely it is that the speaker is expecting explicit assent from the addressee. In other words, speech acts involve the interaction of the speaker and addressee, not simply the execution of an utterance by the speaker. Requests are satisfied when they are complied with, i. e. causing the requestee to make the world fit the content of the request. Morally speaking, it is a virtue to be ready to help others when they are in need of help, but it does not mean that we should

not say "No" to a request for help. In fact, when the request is beyond our ability or it is illegal, we should not be hesitant to say "No". However, even on these occasions, there are people who find it hard to say "No". This is largely because they are afraid of "losing face". They fear to be considered incompetent if they admit themselves incapable of offering the help; they fear to be regarded as miserly or selfish if they turn down a request from a friend; they fear to be laughed at as a coward if they refuse to help to do something dangerous, sometimes even illegal. However, it is also harmful not to say "No" when you ought to, because instead of giving others help, you may probably put yourself into trouble. If you force yourself to do something beyond your means, you may go astray, too. Well, the requesting responses in our questionnaire survey generally do not constitute any kind of flavor of illegality, but obviously involve people's ability and facework. Even in certain situations where people have to refuse, they must offer some reasons and select appropriate strategies, just as Beebe, et al. (1985) put, Americans usually employ three major strategies which were found to be used in sequence at the beginning of a refusal. These were (a) an expression of positive opinion such as "I'd like to", (b) an expression of regret such as "I'm sorry", and (c) an excuse, reason or explanation such as "My children will be home that night" or "I have a headache". Other strategies include a statement of an alternative, a condition for future or past acceptance (e. g. If you had asked me earlier...), a promise of future acceptance (e. g. I'll do it next time.), a statement of principle (e. g. I never do business with friends.), a statement of philosophy (e. g. One can't be too careful.), a statement letting the interlocutor off the hook (e. g. Don't worry about it.), self-defense (e. g. I'm doing my best.) and nonverbal avoidance such as silence or a topic switch.

Though responses to requests are of vital significance, very little attention has been paid to them in the speech act literature and now most of



the acts under research are initiating acts which are characterized and listed in the works of linguists such as Austin (1962), Ohmann (1972), Vendler (1972), Bach & Harnish (1979), Searle (1979), Searle & Vanderveken (1985). The main reasons may be: (a) the description of illocutionary acts is often done by the semantic analysis of performative verbs instead of the functional examination of utterances in discourse. (b) many responding acts do not have a corresponding performative verb at all, as in Example (1). (c) comparatively speaking, the initiating acts seem to play a more important role than responses in the whole components of a speech act.

(1) A: Hey, can you guys give me a lift when you all go home?

B: Oh, I don't know.

B's response to A's request for permission to get a lift home cannot be described in terms of the performative verb because B does not have such a choice at all. So its illocutionary force can only be obtained from the expressions like "I don't know", which means that B "refuses in a vague manner to commit himself". The next issue is how to identify a responding move in discourse. Obviously not any move following an initiating move is the right responding move in (2).

(2) A: What's the time now? Please tell me.

B: a. Ten.

b. Time for lunch.

c. I have no watch on myself.

d. Ask Xiao Zhang.

All of B's responses are related to A's requesting for time information. But only (a) and (b) are the responding moves because they fulfil the illocutionary force of A's elicitation, they provide what A wants to seek, although (b) is somewhat indirect. A can deduce the relevant information from the lunch time. However (c), (d) do not fulfil the illocutionary force of A's elicitation. The main reasons lie in the pragmatic felicity conditions of a request. Tsui (2000) classifies the responses to a request into two

categories: positive responding act and negative responding act (including temporization) in (3).

(3) A: Excuse me, could you pass me the ball, please?

B: a. Yes.

b. No, I could not.

c. Oh, I don't know.

According to Tsui, in B's responses, (a) is a positive responding acts, (b) is a negative responding act and (c) also belongs to negative responding acts: it's a kind of act to postpone the decision-making. As for (a) and (b), I agree with Tsui's classification. But for (c), I have a different idea that it should not be put into the negative acts, because it suspends the answer between "yes" and "no". We'd better offer another category to this act—null responding act (i. e. meaningless act, to some extent) for the time being.

In light of our findings, there do exist three types of responses, they are positive, null and negative respectively. To obtain more information concerning politeness, verbosity or terseness in discourse among three groups (i. e. the CHN, the AM, the IL), we classify positive and negative responses further into three different levels: A, B and C respectively. A is the simplest act with only one utterance like "yes" or "no"; B is an act with a little bit explanation of two utterances and C, an act with enthusiastic explanations of over two utterances. And here null responses refer to suspending responses like (c) in (3), we would not classify null responses into three different levels because any kind of levels, long or short, is still dubious, so it is of no great significance for our analyses in the present study. For the sake of describing convenience we would use the symbol " \emptyset " to stand for it in our statistical tables of later analyses. Examples of the three different levels of positive and negative response categories are delineated as below:

Positive responses in (4)

(4) A: Hey, guys, can you give me a lift home?

B: (A) Sure.

(B) Sure, get in please.

(C) Yeah, no problem, which end of the street do you live at?

Negative responses in (5)

(5) A: Excuse me, ma'am? I wonder if you happen to have change for a five-pound note. I don't have any change for the meter and I see a meter maid coming. Thanks a lot!

B: (A) No.

(B) Sorry, I don't have, either.

(C) Sorry, I have used up for my parking yesterday and now I do not have got yet.

Apart from the above three kinds of responses, in real discourse we would often encounter the fourth one—non-verbal responses from the addressee such as in (6).

(6) (在人才招聘会的一个摊位上。)

(In front of one stand for a talent recruitment fair.)

招聘人:请先谈谈你的情况。

(Recruiter: First introduce something about yourself, please.)

应聘人:我本科学的是师范,我很喜欢做老师。

(Recrutee: My major for BA is teaching, and I do like to be a teacher.)

招聘人点头。

(Recruiter nods his head.)

应聘人:本科毕业后,我在中学任教了五年,已拿到中级职称。

(Recrutee: After I graduated for BA study, I have worked at a middle school for five years, obtaining a intermediate position in my profession.)

招聘人点头。

(*Recruiter nods his head.*)

应聘人:我已在各种刊物上发表六篇专业学术论文。

(*Recruitee: I have already published 6 professional academic papers in all kinds of journals.*)

In this situation the addressee would simply respond with the nodding of his or her head, namely, body language. It is a pity that we can't acquire this kind of information due to the written form of our questionnaire survey. Now let us examine the actual situations in which Americans, Chinese people and English language learners choose among kinds of responses to requests.

1.2 Subjects

There are three groups of subjects (totalling 324) from colleges or universities¹ participating in this study: a group of NSs of American English (AM, totalling 84 with 33 males to 51 females), a group of Chinese learners of English (IL, totaling 128, with 16 males to 112 females), and a group of NSs of Mandarin Chinese (CHN, totalling 112 with 64 males to 48 females). We choose the three groups as our subjects mainly because native speakers of American English can represent the Occidental culture, native speakers of Chinese in the mainland can represent the Oriental culture and the interlanguage speakers stay between the two poles of opposite cultures. In other words, (a) American English, instead of British English, nowadays dominates most of the world media, and almost all aspects of our daily life. For example, TOEFL is taken every year around every corner of the globe; (b) the mainland Chinese enjoys the most authoritative status in the Chinese language and has over one billion speakers and it's used widely across the whole country, even in Taiwan, Macao and Hong Kong; (c) from the IL group we can get some information concerning how the non-native speakers who keep their own culture are influenced by Western culture. We do believe that we can find out where the major differences in request responses

between them lie in by the comparison of the three groups. As for the number of the subjects in our survey, I would like to say something more. Here we are chiefly concerned with the probability distribution of the request responses, i. e. the percentage rather than the number itself. The reason is that even 1,000 or 10,000 subjects are not enough if considered exclusively from the quantitative perspective. Actually, we could not exhaust the infinite number, and meanwhile it is not necessary for us to do so, especially in social science study.

1.3 The Questionnaire

Social distance between interlocutors is considered to be low (- SD) for members of a nuclear family, friends and relatives, and high (+ SD) for strangers. By dominance, we mean the power of the speaker over the hearer in a given role relationship. Thus, a situation in which a lecturer is speaking to a student is considered to be speaker dominant ($X > Y$), but status equals ($X = Y$) if the exchange is taking place between two students (Montserrat, 1999). Table 1 below shows the variation of social distance and social power (dominance) in our questionnaire survey situations. We employ 12 situations altogether², they are situations 1-8, 12 taken from the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka, et al., 1989: 14-15), situations 9 and 10 from Gibbs (1985), situation 11 from Fraser, et al. (1980). However, the questions are designed by the author of this paper. For more details, see the APPENDIX.

Table 1 Social distance and dominance variation for each request responding situation

Situations	Social distance	Dominance
S1 Kitchen	- SD	$X = Y$
S2 Street	+ SD	$X = Y$
S3 Notes	- SD	$X = Y$