

功能语言学在中国的进展

胡壮麟 方琰 主编

功能语言学 在中国的进展



清华大学出版社

功能语言学在中国的进展

**ADVANCES IN FUNCTIONAL
LINGUISTICS IN CHINA**

胡壮麟 方 琰 主编

清华大学出版社

(京)新登字 158 号

内 容 提 要

第 22 届国际系统功能语言学大会和第 4 届中国系统功能语法会议于 1995 年 7 月 18 日~22 日在北京大学同时举行,参加大会的除 110 名境外学者外,还有来自国内 50 所高校的代表 116 名。本论文集选编了国内代表所发表的论文和文摘 40 篇,按其内容划分为总类、功能语法、语篇分析和外语教学四个部分,前两者偏重于理论,后两者着眼于应用。

本书适用范围:高等院校语言文学专业教师、研究生及语言工作者。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

功能语言学在中国的进展/胡壮麟,方琰主编. —北京:清华大学出版社,1997

ISBN 7-302-02586-X

I. 中… I. ①胡… ②方… II. 功能(语言学)-进展-文集
IV. HO-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(97)第 13308 号

出版者:清华大学出版社(北京清华大学校内,邮编 100084)

<http://www.tup.tsinghua.edu.cn>

印刷者:人民文学印刷厂

发行者:新华书店总店北京科技发行所

开 本:850×1168 1/32 印张:12.125 字数:313 千字

版 次:1997 年 9 月第 1 版 1998 年 7 月第 2 次印刷

书 号:ISBN 7-302-02586-X/H·184

印 数:2001~4000

定 价:18.00 元

编者的话

1995年7月18日—22日第二十二届国际系统功能语言学大会和第四届中国系统功能语法会议在我国北京大学同时召开,这是我国系统功能语言学研究发展的一个里程碑,标志着我国系统功能语言学研究已取得重大成就并走向世界。参加大会的除110名境外学者外,国内学者来自国内17个省、市、自治区的50所高等院校和科研单位,人数达116名之多,另有旁听与会者多人。

国内代表所发表的论文在深度和广度上都超过了前三届会议。许多论文已不再停留在对系统功能理论的引入和介绍,而是进行大胆的质疑和修正,提出自己的解释或模式。尽管这仅是初步的、不成熟的,但毕竟是一个良好的开端。有的论文回顾了我国的功能语言学传统或结合汉语的特征进行研究,特别是本次大会有不少汉语界的学者参加,可以预见的是,经过我国外语界和汉语界系统功能语言学者的共同努力,具有中国特色的我国系统功能语言学将在国际学术界发挥更大作用,作出更大的贡献;任何理论的价值在于应用,本书中收入了不少将系统功能理论应用于有关语篇分析、文体学、外语教学和翻译等方面的研究成果,表明了系统功能理论的强大生命力和实用价值,已受到学术界、教育界、翻译界更多专业人士的注目和欢迎。事实已经表明,越来越多的中青年学者,包括在校的博士生、硕士生,已经投入到这个研究大军中,本书的许多内容反映了这方面的成就。

为方便阅读,我们把论文和文摘按四个部分分类编排,即总类、功能语法、语篇分析和外语教学,前两者偏重于理论,后两者则

着眼于应用。每一部分先论文,后摘要,使讨论的问题比较集中。摘要中不乏优秀之作,但由于篇幅关系,不能全文收录,望作者和读者鉴谅。在参考文献方面,本书采用集中编排的方法,先英文后中文,英文按字母顺序编排,中文按拼音顺序编排。在具体论文中,则保留有关文献的作者和年份,以备查阅。

当前,要出版一部学术著作甚不容易。本书的出版是与本书撰稿者的齐心协力和相互支持是分不开的。我们也感谢香港中国语文学会安子介基金慷慨资助本书的部分出版费用,相信内地和香港同行今后会有更多的合作。最后我们感谢清华大学出版社继《语篇·语言·语境》一书后,再次以高瞻远瞩的战略眼光,促成本书出版。我们从他们的热情支持之中,感受到我国出版事业中一支说实话办实事的健康力量。

胡壮麟、方琰

1996年10月于北京

目 录

一、总类	(1)
A Functional Trend in the Study of Chinese	方 琰、沈明波(1)
Jespersen's Functional Approach to Grammar	任绍曾(15)
Functionality on Halliday's Functional Grammar	熊学亮(30)
Halliday 的语言符号系统	杨信彰(42)
Language and Culture in a Systemic Functional Perspective	杨潮光(49)
二、功能语法	(61)
Reflections on a Multi-Level Model of Textual Cohesion and Coherence	胡壮麟(61)
方位小句的语符关系	程琪龙(88)
从文化与功能的角度解释汉语的语序	张德禄(99)
英语存在过程的主位分析	黄国文(106)
Patterns of Lexis and Information Distribution	彭望衡(119)
指人参与者角色关系趋向与汉语动词的一些小类	马庆株(135)
论“延—终—延”微系统与功能	王 寅(144)
衔接和谐与知识推理	索玉柱(155)
The Interaction between Mode and the Textual Metafunction	陈治安、刘 华(165)
A Systemic-Functional Approach to Conversational Implicature #	封宗信(173)
韩礼德的隐喻与格赖斯的会话含义 #	李秀丽(174)
Functions of Grammatical Metaphors #	康宗敏(176)
Hedges: a Study in Social Functions #	李福印(178)
Collective and Distributive Interpretation of Some Quantifiers in Chinese #	卓新贤(179)
Thematic Structures in Modern Chinese #	向明友(181)

三、语篇分析 (184)

Systemic-Functional Grammar and Stylistics ... 郭 鸿、吴 沙(184)

The Interpersonal Function in Literary Narration 刘世生(197)

Time as a Key in Raymond Carver's Short Story

Where I'm Calling From 吕中舌(215)

Coordinate Description of Style and

A Model of Style Organization 彭宣维(230)

The Construction of Gender and Characters

Through Tenor Choices in Literary Works 朱士昌(239)

Analysis of the Poem *Shui Diao Ge Tou* from

the Functional Perspective # 刘家荣、段 芸(252)

Temporal Interpretation of FIS Episodes # 俞洪亮(253)

The Theory of Theme and its Application to

Drama Analysis # 王 玲(254)

The Reference Mechanism and the Determination of

Information Status of Discourse Referents # 吕公礼(256)

广告分析:从语法隐喻到符号隐喻 # 范亚刚(258)

Advertising Language: A Systemic-Functional

Approach # 左 岩(259)

Orientalism and its Features of Othering

in Colonial Discourse # 罗建生(261)

Discourse Cohesion and Rhetorical Devices # 张燕春(263)

The Relationship between Social Semiotics and Lexical Pattern

in Linguistic Description # 邹海琦(265)

四、外语教学、翻译和其他 (267)

Context and the Teaching of EFL Reading 乐眉云(267)

The Free Talker and the Chained Writer—a Comparison

between Two ESL Students' Compositions 高一虹(288)

通过朗读中的篇章重音把握信息焦点 李战子(308)

Explorations into a Multi-Level System in Language and

Its Applications to TEFL Strategies # 王琼文(318)

Thematic Analysis of Paragraphs and Writing

in EFL # 战秀琴(320)

Hasan 的语类结构潜势理论在英语应用文 写作教学中的应用 #	方 琰、兰 青 (324)
Discourse Features of the English Writing of Chinese Students #	Linda Stump Rashidi、战秀琴 (325)
Using On-Line Bilingual Text Production for Assessing Communicative Performnce in ESL Contexts #	黄会键 (328)
Choice of Language; The Use of Mother Tongue in L2 Classrooms #	吴宗杰 (331)
Register Theory and Language Teaching #	王莉娅 (332)
Cohesion, Script and Note-taking for Consecutive Interpretation #	纪康丽 (334)
语言学习之涵义 — 谈语言交际中的 跨文化差异 #	希拉里·布尔、张朝宜 (335)
语法隐喻对语篇阅读难易度的影响 #	范文芳 (337)
语境与跨文化交际中的禁忌语 #	田贵森 (339)
英语学习中目标语社会文化规则中的几个问题 #	郑 康 (341)
Teaching English in a Setting of Chinese Culture #	刘新义、张京生 (343)
Impact of Cross-cultural Communication on Teaching English as a Foreign Language #	雷冬梅 (344)
Oral English Communicative Test in a Language Laboratory #	齐德峰、高素珍 (346)
英语演说辞篇章的汉译 #	徐振忠 (348)
Third-person Reference Forms and Their Translation into Chinese #	罗爱荣 (351)
Factors Leading to Differences between Chinese Culture and Western Culture #	冯改萍 (354)
参考文献	(356)

(注:后附 # 号者为论文摘要)

一、总 类

A Functional Trend in the Study of Chinese

Fang Yan (方琰) & Shen Mingbo (沈明波)

Tsinghua University

1. Introductory Words

This paper addresses itself to the verification of the hypothesis that a functional trend may exist in the study of Chinese, a language with few morphological inflections (Lu Shuxiang 1979 Halliday 1991), with a view to promote the setting up of a theory serving a better description of the Chinese grammar.

2. Concept of Functionalism

‘Functionalism’ in this paper is used in a broad sense. It covers the following aspects:

A. Language is an instrument of social interaction (Richards et al 1985; Halliday 1973; Scheffczyk 1986; Ducrot & Todorov 1979; Crystal 1991; Thompson 1992; Trask 1993; Lyons 1981).

B. Language is seen as multi-strata with semantics as the

focus(Halliday 1985).

C. A language is interpreted as a system of meanings, accompanied by forms through which the meanings can be realized (Halliday 1985).

D. Text is the focus of study, and is studied with reliance upon context(Lyons 1981; Halliday 1985).

E. Particular importance is attached to grammatical relations (Subject, Complement, etc.) and/or to semantic roles (Agent, Patient, Goal, etc.)(Trask 1993).

F. Each element in a language is explained by reference to its function in the total linguistic system (Halliday 1985; Ducrot & Todorov 1979; Crystal 1991; Trask 1993).

3. Development of Chinese Functionalism

We shall hereafter sketch the development of the functional trend in four periods in the tradition of Chinese linguistic study: the embryonic period, the imitation period, the reform period and the flourishing period, following Gong Qianyan(1987) in his A History of Chinese Grammar.

3.1 The Embryonic Period of Chinese Linguistic Study (475BC—1897AD)

This period is also referred to as the ‘prelinguistic period’, attention being given to interpreting ancient texts(训诂学) with its focus on the study of lexical meaning such as synonyms, antonyms, and polysemy. But this does not mean that syntactic features were never studied. Some aspects of syntax such as

function words and inversion were investigated, not for the study of form, but for explaining ancient texts, or for the study of meaning. Even in this stage, we can find traces of functionalism, despite their being fragmentary and unsystematic, as exemplified in the study of function words in On the Structures of Chinese Characters (Xu Shen), and in the initial exploration into context.

3. 2 The Imitation Period of Chinese Linguistic Study (1898—1937)

The publications of Ma's Grammar and Li Jinxi's A New Chinese Grammar, which marked the beginning of systematic grammatical study of Chinese, were modeled following the traditional Western grammars; as a result, many special features of Chinese were ignored.

Chinese Functionalism, if there was any, still remained as an undercurrent. Liu Fu grouped adjectives and verbs together as they were similar in function (Gong Qianyan 1987). Ma Jianzhong realized the influence of context on word class (Ma Jianzhong 1988).

3. 3 The Reform Period of Chinese Linguistic Study (1938—1949)

The reform period is characterized by an effort of Chinese linguists to shake off the fetters of Western grammars and probe into the unique features of Chinese. Chen Wangdao, Lu Shuxiang and Wang Li are three representative linguists of this period.

Chen Wangdao was the first to state explicitly the necessity to study Chinese in a functional way. 'In the study of Chinese grammar, many grammarians are wavering between a form-centered theory and a meaning-centered theory. Both theories have some weaknesses, which, in my opinion, can be counteracted by a function-centered theory.' (Chen Wangdao 1980) He suggested that function be used as a criterion to classify words. He defined function as the capacity of a word to combine with other words (Ibid.). Here the meaning of function in Chen's term is similar to that of collocation. However, he extended function to the concept of word class in a sentence (Ibid. 1978). But he didn't state clearly the relationship between meaning and function and his study was not yet systematic.

Chen's contributions to the functional view of grammar also lie in his revealing the importance of context in studying Chinese. In his work On Rhetoric, he emphasized that 'rhetoric must accord with context' (Ibid. 1982). He further formulated the Theory of Six Wh-, referring to 'the six elements of context' (Ibid.). Although Chen's study of context was limited exclusively to rhetoric, his recognition of the significance of context merits our notice.

In Lu Shuxiang's and Wang Li's works we can also see their functional bias. Since Hu Zhuanglin (1991) already discussed Wang Li's functional points of view at length, the following paragraphs will be devoted to discussing Lu Shuxiang's representative work Essentials of Chinese Grammar and some articles only.

3. 3. 1 Essentials of Chinese Grammar

3. 3. 1. 1 Linguistic Outlook

1) Language as a Social Product

Functionalists hold that language is a product of social process; Lu Shuxiang expressed a similar idea in his works (1990a).

2) Meaning as the Starting Point

Functionalists interpret a language as a network of relations, with structures coming in as the realizations of these relationships; they take semantics as the foundation. What Lu did in the second part of Essentials of Chinese Grammar — ‘On Expression’ coincides with the functional interpretation. In this part, Chinese is interpreted as a system of meanings, such as the systems of number, place and time, and the forms through which the meanings can be expressed are also studied.

Lu’s approach to linguistics, therefore, is a combination of formal approach and functional one — both form and meaning are emphasized.

3) Language as a Multi-Level System

Lu shared the functionalist point of view of regarding language as a multi-level system, which is well manifested in his analysis of mood in Chinese. He said, ‘Mood can be expressed by both intonation and mood particles. Intonation is indispensable, while mood particles sometimes can be omitted.’ So mood can be expressed at both lexico-grammatical level (by mood particles) and phonological level (by intonation)(1990a).

3. 3. 1. 2 Grammatical Concepts

1) Complement Theory

In discussing the narrative sentence, Lu pointed out that any word involved in an action plays a role in illustrating the action, and it is thus called a complement. There are mainly ten types of complements: initiator, terminal, beneficiary I, beneficiary II, coinicator, means, location, time, cause and aim (English translations by the authors). Thus, a clause in the indicative mood can be analyzed from the angle of the relation between the verb and various complements. Bearing remarkable resemblance to Fillmore's Case Grammar and Halliday's Transitivity System, Lu's Complement Theory was proposed in 1942, over 20 years earlier than its Western counterparts.

2) Starting Word—End Word Theory

In his article "An Analysis of Chinese Sentence Patterns by Distinguishing Subject and Object" (1990b), Lu proposed Starting Word — End Word Theory. In this article, he summarized and analyzed 14 types of sentence patterns according to word order and the relation between actor and goal. The following are two types of sentence patterns which are of significance here.

a. Sentence Pattern: Goal + Actor + Verb

(1) 这个(G)我(A)不知道(V)。

b. Sentence Pattern: Verb + Actor

(2) 榻上坐着(V)一个老头子(A)。

Lu concluded that these two patterns were built on the same

psychology; in Group a, something about which the hearer already knows is put at the beginning; in Group b, circumstantial elements are put at the beginning, while the new information is reserved to the end. In short, the information which is already known will precede the new information. Lu called the former 'starting word' and the latter 'end word', which coincide with Theme and New in Prague School's terminology. The way he analyzed the sentence (3) 'Big fish eat small fish. Small fish eat shrimps. Shrimps hump their backs to eat mud.' is similar to Danes' simple linear Thematic Progression pattern. Nonetheless, due to the influence of formal linguistics, Lu's approach to language is still different from functional linguistics. For instance, he analysed 14 types of sentence patterns by following the traditional concepts of the above mentioned article; in addition, his study of Chinese grammar was mostly organized around the sentence instead of the text.

3. 4 The Flourishing Period of Chinese Linguistic Study (1949—)

3. 4. 1 1949 — 1960s

This period saw the booming development of Chinese linguistic studies; (1) the publication of a great variety of linguistic works (For example, A Guide to Grammar and Rhetoric (1951) by Lu Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi); (2) two nation-wide discussions on linguistics (the Discussion on the Classification of Word Classes and the Discussion on Subject/Object Distinction). However, because of the weak basis of linguistic research in China, no sys-

tematic linguistic theories came into being in this period.

Though no functional theories took shape in China, the functional trend manifested itself by taking meaning as the focus of study, conducting word classification according to functions and contexts; the functional trend can also be witnessed by looking at the functional bias as manifested in some works, which laid a foundation for the development of Chinese Functionalism in the 1980s. Due to the limit of space, we shall elaborate on the functional bias only.

For example, a certain functional bias was shown in A Guide to Grammar and Rhetoric by Lu Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi.

First, the book took a pragmatic view of language, with the purpose of 'correcting errors'. Gong Qianyan (1987) pointed out, 'this book played a great part in standardizing the Chinese language.' Second, the authors provided a functional interpretation of punctuation marks. 'Punctuation marks are an integral part of language, rather than things added to the language. ... Each punctuation mark performs a specific role; therefore, it is reasonable to classify them as one type of function words. They should be treated in the same way as function words "的", "呢", and "吗". ... For instance, due to the use of the question mark, mood particles like "吗" and "呢" are often omitted.' (Lu Shuxiang & Zhu Dexi 1951).

3.4.2 Late 1970s on

Suspended for more than ten years during the Cultural Revolution, Chinese linguistic study resumed only in the late 1970s.

In the following paragraphs, we shall sketch the development of functionalism in China from two perspectives: development in theory and application of Western functional theories to the study of Chinese.

3. 4. 2. 1. Development in Theory

Chinese Functionalism was beginning to take shape in theory in the 1980s. The first one is the three-level theory, that is, grammatical analysis should be carried out on the levels of syntax, semantics and pragmatics (Wen Lian & Hu Fu 1984; Zhu Dexi 1985; Hu Yushu & Fan Xiao 1985).

Because of the limit of space, we shall focus our attention on Hu and Fan's article only. They (1985) distinguished the three grammatical levels corresponding to syntactic analysis, semantic analysis and pragmatic analysis respectively. Please look at the following examples (Ibid.)

(4) 我读过《红楼梦》了。

(5) 《红楼梦》我读过了。

Sentence (4), on the syntactic level, can be analyzed as 'Subject + Predicate + Object' and on the semantic level, as 'Actor + ... + Goal' ('...' not specified). Sentence (5) has the same semantic structure as Sentence (4), while its syntactic structure is rather different from that of Sentence (4). Why is the same semantic structure expressed by different syntactic structures? This question can be answered only when these sentences are analyzed from the pragmatic perspective. In Sentence (4), "我" is Topic (主题), which the hearer already knows; in