

21. - Questions.  
 a) Répondez aux questions.  
 1. Quelle est la chose la plus belle ?  
 2. Qu'est-ce qui est le moins beau ?  
 3. Quel est le meilleur moment de l'année ?  
 4. Quel est le pire moment de l'année ?  
 5. Quel est le plus grand plaisir de la vie ?  
 6. Quel est le plus grand tourment de la vie ?  
 7. Quel est le plus grand bonheur de la vie ?  
 8. Quel est le plus grand malheur de la vie ?  
 9. Quel est le plus grand espoir de la vie ?  
 10. Quel est le plus grand désespoir de la vie ?  
 b) À votre tour, faites de même et posez-les à vos amis.

22. - Le plus... le moins... le pire.  
 Terminez les phrases suivantes :  
 le / la plus... / le / la moins... / le / la pire... /

Exemple :  
 Mon accident de voiture...  
 ...a été le pire moment de ma vie.  
 ...a été le moins dramatique moment de ma vie.  
 ...a été le moins dramatique moment de ma vie.  
 1. Le jour de son mariage.  
 2. L'arrivée du premier hiver.  
 3. La destruction de la nature.  
 4. L'invention de la voiture.  
 5. La pièce que nous avons vue.  
 6. La naissance de ma fille.  
 7. La destruction du mur de Berlin.  
 8. L'ouverture de l'Europe.

# 语篇分析的 伯克新修辞模式

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS  
 FROM THE PERSPECTIVE  
 OF BURKEAN NEW RHETORIC

山东省社会科学规划研究项目文丛·重点项目·

鞠玉梅 ◎著

湖南人民出版社

21. - Questions.  
Répondez aux questions suivantes.  
1. Quelle est la chose la plus importante de votre vie ? - 2. Qu'est-ce que vous aimez le moins ? - 3. Quel est, à votre avis, le meilleur souvenir de l'année ? - 4. Où aimez-vous aller passer vos vacances ? - 5. Qu'est-ce qui vous a fait le plus rire ? - 6. Quel est votre souvenir d'enfance ? - 7. Quel est votre meilleur ami ? - 8. Quel est votre pire défaut ?  
22. - Le meilleur, le pire.  
Terminez les phrases suivantes en utilisant le / la plus... / le / la meilleur(e)... / le / la moins... / le / la pire...  
Exemple :  
Mon accident de voiture  
- a été le pire moment de mon existence.  
- restera le plus mauvais souvenir de ma vie.  
- a été le moins dramatique de tous les événements.  
1. Le jour de son licenciement .....  
2. L'arrivée du premier homme sur la lune .....  
3. La destruction de la nature .....  
4. L'invention de la voiture anti-pollution .....  
5. La pièce que nous avons vue samedi dernier .....  
6. La naissance de ma fille .....  
7. La destruction du mur de Berlin .....  
8. L'ouverture de l'Europe en 1992 .....

# 语篇分析 伯克新修辞模式

山东省社会科学规划研究项目文丛·重点项目

鞠玉梅 著

湖南人民出版社

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语篇分析的伯克新修辞模式 = Discourse Analysis  
from the Perspective of Burkean New Rhetoric/  
鞠玉梅著. —长沙:湖南人民出版社, 2005. 12

ISBN 7-5438-4150-9

I. 语... II. 鞠... III. 语言分析-英文 IV. H0

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2005)第 133422 号

责任编辑:李 林  
装帧设计:魏 剑

## 语篇分析的伯克新修辞模式

鞠玉梅 著

\*

湖南人民出版社出版、发行

网址: <http://www.hnppp.com>

(长沙市营盘东路 3 号 邮编: 410005)

湖南省新华书店经销 湖南省航务管理局印刷厂

2005 年 12 月第 1 版第 1 次印刷

开本: 850×1168 1/32 印张: 9.5

字数: 200,000

ISBN 7-5438-4150-9

H·164 定价: 22.00 元

## · 作者简介 ·

**鞠玉梅**，女。毕业于上海外国语大学，获外国语言学及应用语言学专业博士学位。曲阜师范大学英语教授、硕士研究生导师，现任曲阜师范大学外国语学院院长。在外语类学术期刊上发表论文29篇，独立撰写出版专著2部，主编出版教材7部，主持并完成省部级科研课题1项，获得省部级科研奖励1项。主要研究领域为修辞学、语篇分析与文体学。

责任编辑◎李 林  
装帧设计◎虢 剑

责任编辑◎李 林  
装帧设计◎虢 剑

## 《山东省社会科学规划研究项目文丛》编委会

主任委员 王 敏

副主任委员 张全新

委 员 (以姓氏笔画为序)

王兆成 尹慧敏 齐 涛 刘德龙

李天军 李新泰 张 华 蒿 峰

## 序

当 Kenneth Burke 在 1935 年给出版社送去一本对修辞的意义和动机进行阐释的书时，编辑却向书的题目发难，因为题目中有 communication 这么个词，而当时 communication 只被认为与电话通讯有关，与人际交流或信息传播无关。为此，Burke 只得改换题目。然而，在现今西方人文学科的文献中，communication 就表示交流或传播，就是大修辞学。Kenneth Burke 一生发表了卷帙浩繁的论著，其中有许多是对修辞分析范围的重新定义和拓宽，他从大视野的角度，对修辞传播理论的构建做出了巨大的贡献，他已被认作西方新修辞学的代表人物，这几乎已是无人争辩的事实。西方曾有学者说，现在无论谁写到交流或传播理论时，他都是在某种程度上重申着 Burke 所发明的那些理论，尽管此说未必人人苟同。

近年来，Kenneth Burke 的新修辞学理论已在国内有所介绍，但是国内用他的理论作过实质性研究的学人不多。如今，我们非常高兴地读到了鞠玉梅教授的

《语篇分析的伯克新修辞模式》，她有效地汲取了Burke最为成功的五位一体戏剧性修辞理论的营养，并在此基础上提出了对英语语体和语篇进行研究的修辞理论模式。这一研究成果具有普罗米修斯勇于创新的特点，在修辞研究和语篇分析等领域中具有领先的作用。

鞠玉梅教授的研究工作，早在上个世纪末就因她的《英语文体学》为学界所知晓，现在她的这一新成果以其崭新的面貌及独特的视角发聋振聩，使人大开眼界，为之敬佩。作为她的导师，也作为学术同好，我希望她能在学术研究的道路上取得更大的成绩。

胡曙中

2005年11月于上海外国语大学



## **Acknowledgements**

This book was completed at the College of English, Shanghai International Studies University in 2004. Many people have helped me during my study in Shanghai International Studies University. They have given me a great deal of intellectual and personal help in the process of writing the book. Professionally, I am definitely the product of the very stimulating environment of Shanghai International Studies University. It is the teaching, lecturing and help of a lot of scholars there that have bettered my understanding of linguistics and its relevant subjects.

Professor Hu Shuzhong, my supervisor, fueled my interest in rhetoric from the very beginning. His influence on me and on my work is enormous. His continued support and encouragement has propelled me through the whole study. His critical readings of my term papers and informative advice have been of utmost importance in my becoming academically trained. His serious scholarship and academ-

ic practices and his agreeable personalities have influenced me immensely. He helped me acquire the confidence to undertake this project and he has been extremely helpful in his very constructive criticism of the earlier drafts of the book. I was very fortunate to have him as my supervisor. Without him this work would have been impossible.

Equally important has been the help and influence of my fellow graduate students at Shanghai International Studies University, from whom I learned almost as much as I learned from my teachers, mostly through informal, semi-formal, and formal seminars, hallway chats, and discussions during lunches and dinner gatherings. Our dialogue has continually refreshed my curiosity about rhetoric and linguistics. A partial list would include Jiang Yajun, Chai Gaiying, Zhao Donglin, Wu Xueying, Wang Dong, Jiang Ping, Zhao Mingwei, Ma Wen, Hou Guojin, Lu Weizhong and Yao Ximing. Their contribution to my work in general and this study in particular has been extremely valuable.

And there are my American English native friends of many years, Paul Johnson and Carole Johnson, who made me feel at home whenever and wherever we were together and when separated the e-mail exchanges between us made me feel good about myself and, to top it off, they brought me a heavy bag of books by and on Kenneth Burke when

they visited me in the Spring of 2003, at a time when SARS was rampant in China.

I would also like to particularly express my heartfelt thanks to those scholars and authors whose works I have consulted. I owe much to Kenneth Burke whose rhetorical theory provides the theoretical basis for this study.

Last, but not, of course, least, thanks should go to my family. My parents have given me the greatest encouragement and support all through my school studies and research work. Their never-ending confidence in my success is an ever-present source of understanding and love. My husband and my son have tolerated my being away from home for three years. Their independence in life and work means a lot to me.

Despite my undeniable indebtedness to the help of all these kind people, any errors or shortcomings of this book are my sole responsibility.

## **Abstract**

This study is intended to provide a comprehensive introduction to a relatively new approach to discourse analysis, i. e. the model of discourse analysis from the perspective of Burkean new rhetoric. The focus of the research is upon the construction and implementation of the model. Our data consists of naturally occurring discourses and texts in various situations from a variety of genres.

Discourse analysis, as a study of language use beyond the sentence boundary, has been an increasingly popular and important area of study. Arising out of a variety of disciplines, including linguistics, sociology, psychology and anthropology, discourse analysis has developed into a variety of approaches motivated by a wide range of interests and orientations. Deborah Schiffrin in *Approaches to Discourse* introduces six different ways to do discourse analysis: speech act theory, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, pragmatics, conversation a-

---

analysis and variation analysis. There are some other approaches such as the systemic-functional approach, the critical linguistics approach, the cognitive approach, the literary approach and so on.

There is such a vast range of approaches to discourse analysis. Yet, up to now, to my limited knowledge, there hasn't been any attempt to do discourse analysis systematically from the perspective of Burkean new rhetoric, although rhetoric, a long-established tradition of communication since the days of ancient Greece, is widely claimed as the origin of discourse study. New rhetoric has been largely neglected in discourse analysis and text linguistics. This is why we single out the subject for discussion in this book.

The approach is based on the theory of new rhetoric, which has classical rhetoric as its root and was vastly expanded in its domain and scope of study in the twentieth century. While constructing the model of discourse analysis, we especially refer to the theory of Kenneth Burke, as he is widely acknowledged as the most eminent representative of new rhetoric. We build a model according to his theory of rhetoric and put our model into practice by providing extended analysis of various types of discourse, and reflect on this analytical tool in terms of its theoretical and

pedagogical implications. Our critical practices demonstrate that our model is applicable to the study of discourse, at least to the study of some types of text and to some extent.

By proposing our approach, we do not assume that other approaches to discourse analysis are inadequate. What we want to do is to outline a framework for the critical analysis of discourses from a perspective that has been seldom touched by other scholars. Since it is from another perspective, it may solve problems that haven't been discovered by other approaches.

The present study therefore aims at demonstrating the interdisciplinary nature of new rhetoric and equipping the discourse analyst with the tool to unravel the mysteries of the artifact under consideration and to analyze the ways in which language systems describe and influence human motives. By introducing the Burkean approach, we hope to contribute to the conversation about the nature and function of rhetoric, to open up new possibilities for the study of discourse, to add to the conversation about discourse analysis, and to enlarge its vastness.

The opening chapter situates the work as a contribution to the study of discourse and formulates a set of aims and objectives for the research. The data and methodology

for the present study are stated, too. The final part of Chapter 1 is to give an overview of the whole organization and structure of the book.

Chapter 2 briefly reviews previous literature on discourse analysis as well as relevant approaches to discourse study. Following the literature review is the statement of the present approach, in which we explain the aim and focus of study of our approach and how we try to be different from former approaches.

Chapter 3 sketches theoretical points that are relevant to new rhetoric, including the origin, definition, scope and function of new rhetoric. All these theoretical points serve as the background knowledge for Chapter 4, which focuses on introducing Kenneth Burke, the foremost rhetorician in the twentieth century.

Chapter 4 outlines the basic theoretical assumptions underlying our research work. Our work draws on Burke's theory, specifically his theories of rhetoric, grammar and logology. The focus of each point is upon the elements and functions of symbolic action with different orientations, i. e. identification, dramatism and logology.

Chapter 5 constructs the Burkean model of discourse analysis. While creating the model, we have the following assumptions about language, rhetoric and human being in

mind; Language is a form of social behaviour. Intention and interpretation determine meaning. Texts and discourses are essentially interactive. When analyzing discourse, we need to be aware of the purpose and the process of creation. Ideology and power are extended through discourse. Rhetoric is the study of an interdisciplinary theory of language and meaning. Man is a symbol-using animal, who uses symbols to communicate with one another. The first part of the chapter is the gradual building of the model with a step-by-step procedure. And the framework for analyzing discourse is laid out. The remainder of the chapter is a discussion of the nature of the model.

Chapter 6 is intended to be an application chapter, which aims at a detailed account of the interpretative capability of the Burkean model in the analysis of various genres of discourse.

In the final chapter, some conclusions and implications for pedagogy are presented as well as some suggestions for future research. It is suggested that the result of our study can be incorporated into language teaching and learning classroom and benefit especially those students who are taking advanced writing courses.

Throughout our work we try to argue and illustrate how Kenneth Burke's theories of new rhetoric might play some



role in discourse study. The nature of our model lies in its ability to disclose the orientations that are featured in discourse. It is designed to cut into the heart of any discourse or the wrangle of human relations to reveal its character. It explains the relation among discourse, human being and rhetoric. And it helps to understand how language supplies knowledge, motive and identity.