走向话语的意识形态阐释

——以超链接文本为分析对象

Towards an Ideological Interpretation of Discourse

With Hypertext as the Analysandum

叶起昌 著

Ye Qichang

走向话语的意识形态阐释

——以超链接文本为分析对象

Towards an Ideological Interpretation of Discourse

With Hypertext as the Analysandum

叶起昌　著
Ye Qichang

北京交通大学出版社

·北京·

内 容 简 介

本书是在作者所作的博士论文的基础上修改、补充而成的。

本书主要解决两个相关的问题：（1）从意识形态角度理解超文本；（2）从批评话语分析角度分析超文本。解决第一个问题的途径是从社会实践拥有的基本特征入手，探讨超文本必须拥有的存在条件，认为超文本是通过话语技术化、市场化、商品化、全球化等作用于社会的。第二个问题的切入点是，超文本还是一种交际手段，还得遵循交际规则方能传递信息，所以它是可分析的。

超文本作为网络最主要的显示方式不仅是社会行为，而是全球现象。理解与分析超文本不仅具有很强的现实意义，而且是当务之急。意识形态在这个层次上不仅是观察话语的一个不可忽视的角度，更是自我反思的视角。理解意识形态就必须超越意识形态。以超文本或整个网络而言，自我反思比以往任何时候都更为重要，因为这种超越，从它最深层的意义上说，与网速、软件的升级等无关，而与理解我们自身息息相关。就这个角度而言，超文本再现了一个既常见又总是困扰人们的课题：每种新发明总是把人类摆在它的面前，重新认识自我。超文本更是如此，它再次让我们反思自身的本质，并且每次反思都会给我们带来对人类真理更为贴近的看法。从这个意义上说，从意识形态角度去理解的和分析的就不仅仅是超文本，而是人类自身，这恰恰是本书的真正意义所在。

序

　　叶起昌博士的著作《走向话语的意识形态阐释——以超链接文本为分析对象》终于出版了。作为他的导师，我不免为之雀跃，为之庆贺。

　　起昌在北京师范大学外语学院攻读博士学位期间，专攻"超文本"（hypertext）。这个课题难度相当大，因为它涉及技术科学中的计算机技术、语言学中的话语分析理论、批判性话语分析理论、文学批评中的解构主义，特别是后现代主义的思想。在具体研究中，要搞一些定量分析，会有一定困难。然而，这些都是客观的，比较起来还容易对付。

　　在主观上，起昌要和作为主体的"人"打交道，和形形色色的"人"打交道。首当其冲的当然是我本人。我是起昌的导师，在这个课题上知识有限，仅有的知识又偏重于有关人类文明的口述、读写和超文本之间的关系，在批判性话语分析上能给的帮助很少。而我又是一个性格非常古怪的导师，还偏偏鼓励自己的学生去啃这块硬骨头。我是这样想的：这个课题是当今学术上较新的课题，在我众弟子中，总得有人去打这场硬仗，起昌是个理想的人选。这仗我们不打，谁来打？我们今天不打，什么时候打？

　　事实证明，这场仗非常难打。在学术界，对起昌的论文虽然多数是肯定的，总不免有一两个人持不同看法，或者有一两个人幸灾乐祸。起昌是个书呆子，虽然两度获得优秀博士生的称号，但在与人打交道方面并不比他的导师高明多少。

　　但是，最难办的是起昌要和自己打交道，现实中的起昌要和论文中的起昌打交道。一米八的汉子，碰到一些曲折，居然也会两眼发黑，英雄落泪。生活的复杂就在于当许多事物纠缠在一起时，该如何还它本来面目。该坚持的坚持，该改正的改正，该进一步研究的进一步研究。所幸，起昌很快地就清醒过来了，勇往直前，走自己的路。这不，他的著作经过北京大学和清华大学的学者们审读，如今要出版了。

　　雄关漫道真如铁，而今漫步从头越。起昌应该有这个认识，生活和学术的道路总是崎岖不平的，不怕跌跌撞撞，就怕止步不前。人生的乐趣就在于成功地跨越这样那样的障碍，在胜利的彼岸痛饮庆功酒。

<div align="right">

胡壮麟

北大清华蓝旗营小区

2006 年 5 月 1 日

</div>

前　言

　　本书是在作者的博士论文的基础上经修改和补充而成的。

　　超链接文本（以下简称"超文本"）以超文本标记语言（Hypertext Markup Language，HTML）为基础。超文本是结构文本，文本分成不同的信息单位，称为"接点"。接点可以包含少量的信息或整个文档。两个文本可"链接"在一起，链接源和链接的终点可以是"接点"，也可以是接点中的一个词或短语，读者可跟着链接浏览文档。超文本的具体应用则称为"超链接媒体"（hypermedia）。超链接媒体除文字文本之外还包含其他的符号模式，如图像、影视、声音等。鉴于超文本与超链接媒体的上述关系，本书对文字文本和非文字文本两个概念未作区分，进而将计算机屏幕上显示的任何文本统称为超文本。

　　本书主要解决两个相关问题：（1）如何从意识形态角度去理解超文本；（2）如何从批评话语分析角度去分析超文本。

　　第一个问题涉及意识形态、话语、语篇等的定义及它们之间的关系。追溯上述概念的起源及其演变过程构成了本书的第一章。第二章综述批评话语分析学科，加深对话语与意识形态之间关系的理解。第三章则引入 Paul Ricoeur 的观点：与意识形态概念相对立的不是科学、现实等概念，而是乌托邦。意识形态主要体现为三种功能：对现实的歪曲、合法化和整合。前两种作用是建立在整合功能基础之上的，原因在于仅当社会生活或人的行为业已被符号性地结构化，才存在对现实的歪曲与合法化，因此意识形态也具有褒义。第四章从话语技术化的层面分析超文本的话语特征，认为超文本仅是语篇的一种形式，但不是唯一的存在方式。

　　第二个问题包括批评话语分析的认识论基础、超文本与虚拟现实、超文本的互文性、超文本的读写等方面。第五章致力于从五个方面（词与图像、符号的本质、莱可夫的佐证、视觉交流的特征、屏幕阅读等）来论证批评话语分析的认识论基础。第六章提出应如何认识超文本、虚拟现实和计算机中介交际（CMC）。针对超文本及网络带来的盲目乐观与不切实际的企盼，本书指出，机器是人造的，人们并没有因为上网而变成新的种属。第七章探讨超文本与互文性之间的关系。超文本使得互文性在印刷文本中原先是不可视的某些方面变为可视的，然而什么是可链接的或不可链接的并不取决于读者，而取决于文本的设计者和网站的拥有者。超文本不可能是没有规则的社会性或全球性"游戏"。第八章讨论超文本与书面文本在读写方面的差异。在读与写都是符号（意义）生产的前提下，印刷语篇与超文本有着不同的逻辑：印刷语篇遵循叙事时间，是单线性（linear）展开的，是叙事的世界；超文本遵循视觉空间排列，是多线性（multilinear）展开的，是显示的世界。这些差异形成了读

写在后印刷时代的特征。但不管文本是线性的还是多线性的，都应遵循人类的认知规则和交际原则，超文本并不是真空中的而是现实中的文本，它同样是可分析的。第九章以交际的三大原则为前提，对超文本进行具体的批评话语分析。

由于多语式（multimodality）是超文本的典型特征，对其分析也就不可能只在语言学的视野中，而是在符号学的意义上。毫无疑问，超文本作为网络最主要的显示方式不仅是社会行为，而是全球现象。每天大约有 18,000 个新网站诞生，世界各地的教育机构、政府、企业和个人已经将网络变成这个星球上发展最快的团体。于是，理解与分析超文本不仅具有很强的现实意义，而且是当务之急。同时，我们也不应忽视这样的事实：全球 90% 以上的人口还无法接近网络。

意识形态是观察话语的一个不可忽视的角度，更是自我反思的视角。就后者而言，超文本再现了一个既常见又总是困扰人们的课题：每种新发明总是把人类摆在它的面前，重新认识自我。每次反思也无疑都会给我们带来对人类真理更为贴近的看法。超文本更是如此。在这个意义上说，从意识形态角度去理解的和分析的就不仅仅是超文本了，而是人类自身，这恰恰是本书的真正意义所在。

本书受北京交通大学出版基金赞助。

<div align="right">

著　者

2006 年 5 月

</div>

Foreword

The book is the modified and expanded version of my dissertation.

Hypertext is built on HTML (Hypertext Markup Language). It is a structured text. A text in hypertext is partitioned into amounts of information called "nodes". Nodes may contain only a small amount of information, or may be a whole document. Two pieces of text can be connected together by a "link", where the source and the destination of the link is a node, or a word or a phrase in a node. Readers can move through the document by following these links. Systems which allow the inclusion of other media, such as graphics, animation, video and sound, within the hypertext structure are known as "hypermedia" systems. Since all applications of hypertext are hypermedia, the two terms are interchangeable in this study. Therefore, anything shown on the computer screen is called hypertext in this book.

This study mainly aims to resolve two interrelated problems: (1) to understand hypertext from the perspective of ideology; (2) to analyze hypertext in terms of CDA.

The first problem involves: the definitions of and the relationships among ideology, discourse and text. The task of Chapter 1 consists of tracing back the origins and the evolution of these terms.

Chapter 2 carries out a general survey of CDA in order to get a deep understanding on the relations between discourse and ideology.

Based upon this understanding, Chapter 3 introduces Paul Ricoeur's conception of ideology: ideology is not opposite to science, to reality, but to utopia; ideology has three essential functions: distortion, legitimation and integration. What is more: the first two functions rely on the function of integration; only because the structure of human life is already symbolic can it be distorted and legitimated.

Thus ideology also possesses positive values.

Chapter 4 deals with discursive characteristics of hypertext on the level of technologization of discourse, and insists that hypertext is one among several ways of text existence, not the only one.

The second problem includes: CDA's epistemological foundation, the relationships between hypertext and virtual reality, intertextuality and literacy.

Chapter 5 tries to prove CDA's epistemological foundation on multimodality from five aspects

(the relationships between word and image, the nature of sign, Lakoff et al. 's study as evidence, the characteristics of visual communication and how to read the screen).

Chapter 6 aims to clear the air of false optimism and unrealistic expectation on hypertext, VR, and CMC. The author points out that machines are always man-made; we do not change into a new species when connecting to the Web.

Chapter 7 explores the relationships between hypertext and intertextuality. Hypertext makes it possible to visualize some aspects of intertextuality of the unvisibity in the printed text; what can be connected or not does not depend on readers but on the designer and owner of programs. Hypertext is also a social or global game with rules.

Chapter 8 discusses the literacy in the new media age. Compared with the print text, hypertext obeys the different logic from that of the print text. They are different worlds: the world told and the world shown. While the world told is governed by the logic of time, it is linear; while the world shown is controlled by the logic of space, it is multilinear. These differences form the literate characteristics of post-typographic world. However, no matter whether it is linear or multilinear, a text should follow the three requirements of communication.

On the premise of the three requirements of communication mentioned above, Chapter 9 does the case study of hypertext in CDA.

Due to the typical multimodality of hypertext, its analysis is not confined to the level of linguistics, but within the scope of semiotics. As the most important display of the Net, hypertext is incontestably a social act, also a global phenomenon. The educational institutions, governments, enterprises and individuals in various areas have made the Net becoming the most rapidly expanding community (with about 18,000 new websites coming into being each day!) Thus, to understand and analyze hypertext is of practical significance and also an urgent matter. At the same time, it is imperative to notice the fact that more than 90% of the population of the globe still have not access to the Web.

Ideology is not only a perspective to look at discourse, but also an angle to do self-reflexivity. Seen from the latter angle, hypertext brings us before an old but haunting problem: each of new inventions always puts the inventor (i. e. human beings) before its mirror, to make him re-recognize himself. Hypertext is more than that: it makes us to think over the nature of human being, and each reflexivity always brings us something nearer to the truth of being human. In this sense, to understand and interpret hypertext ideologically is more than doing discourse analysis but knowing ourselves better. That is just the point of this book.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to Professor Hu Zhuanglin, my thesis supervisor. Without his unfailing help, constant encouragement and inspiration, this dissertation would not be possible.

I am greatly indebted to Professor Tian Guisen, Professor Cheng Daxing and Dr. Peng Xuanwei for their help. Their kind help made me feel I have been one of the members on BNU campus in the past three years. And I think I will continue to be and always am.

I want to thank my teachers at Fujian Teachers' University during my MA years. Their help and solicitude constinuously guide and influence me not only in my daily life but also in my research.

I also want to thank my colleagues. Their help and friendship are and will remain a great encouragement to me.

I also want to thank my daughter. Her confidence in me is always an impetus to my academic life.

Finally, I owe to my wife more than to anyone. It is she who has bravely and silently supported the whole family when I was away doing my Ph. D. study. Her support and encouragement are the bases on which each of my words is built. Without them, nothing could have been possible.

Contents

Ⅱ

Chapter 1

An Introduction: Some Basic Terms

1.0 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to get my starting point by introducing certain terms and distinctions, and settling a few substantive matters, before beginning the theme in this dissertation. First, I think it essential to identify more precisely the concepts I shall be discussing, for the nature of social science is explanatory critique, both along the line of Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth: CDA) and that of critical realism.

What is discourse or text? This is perhaps the first question facing discourse analysts when they do discourse analysis, and the question will accompany their research forever, though they only often provide a working hypothesis or just evade answering it squarely. For instance, *Discourse Analysis* (Brown & Yule 1983), now considered as a classic in this respect, does not provide any definition of discourse. One prime reason among many is that the term is ambiguous; this can be reflected in the etymology of the word.

1.1 The Etymology of "Discourse" and That of "Text"

Etymologically, "discourse" is derived from the Latin verb "discurrere" ("to run to and from") and/or the substantive variant "discursus" ("divergence", "melting", "spreading", with the figurative meaning "to hold forth about a subject", "communication about something") (Vass 1992, quoted in Wodak 1996: 32. 5FN). The medieval Latin "discursus", apart from "conversation", "enthusiastic discussion", also means "orbit", "(inter) communication", and "intercourse". In philosophy, Thomas Aquinas (1225/27 – 1274) is the first to use the term. In his work it means something like "mental deduction". "Discursive", by deduction, is contrasted with "very simplici

intuitu" (by simple intuition), that is, knowledge through concepts and thinking in concepts is discursive. This bipolarity can also be found in Hobbes, Leibniz and Kant (1974: 109), who, after all, is of the opinion that human thought in general is discursive. And in my opinion, not only human thought, but also the whole human life is discursive, since symbolic level constitutes the foundation of the society, which is described by Gadamer (1975) as the total of speech and action. Therefore, the main hotline explicitly running through all chapters in this book is that ideology wholly relies on the symbolic nature of human life.

In Britain, it is Geoffrey Chaucer who was the first person to use the word "discourse" in the 14th century. In his work, it means "reasoning"; now this meaning is obsolete (Onion 1966: 272). During the 15th century, the word possessed the archaic meanings of both "conversation, talk" and "treatment of a subject". *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language* (henceforth: *Webster's Third*) (p. 647) provides six usages of the word "discourse". The first usage consists of the two archaic meanings: one is "the reasoning faculty", or "rationality"; the other, "the capacity of proceeding in an orderly and necessary sequence" (used chiefly in the phrase "discourse of reason"). The second usage is obsolete now: "progression or course especially of events". The third usage is "verbal exchange of ideas" or "an instance of such interchange". The fourth usage has the following meanings: "the expression of ideas; especially formal and orderly expression in speech or writing", or "a talk or piece of writing in which a subject is treated at some length usually in an orderly fashion". The fifth usage refers to the "conversational ability (obsolete)", or "account, narrative, tale", or "social familiarity". The last usage is "linguistics: connected speech or writing consisting of more than one sentence". Hence, "discourse analysis" means "structural analysis of texts larger than one sentence"(ibid, p. 647). The last meaning is compatible with the definition by Stubbs (1983), which is cited in the beginning of the following section.

The concept of text also has a long history. The word "text" derives from the Latin word "textus", meaning "tissue"; the verb form of the Latin word "textus" is "texere", meaning "to weave"; and the Latin word "texture" is roughly equal to English word "fabric". The term "context" comes from the Latin term "contextus", meaning "connection of words or coherence"; and "contextere", meaning "to weave together". *Webster's Third* (p. 2365 – 6) also gives us six different usages of the word. The first usage is made up of the following meanings: "1 a (1): the original written or printed words and form of a literary work; (2): an edited or emended copy of the wording of an original work; b: a work containing such text. " The second usage consists of: "2 a: the main body of printed or written matter on a page exclusive of headings, running title, footnotes, illustrations, or margins; b: the principal part of a book exclusive of the front and back matter. " The third usage possesses the following meanings: "3 a(1): a verse or passage of

Scripture chosen especially for the subject of a sermon or for authoritative support; (2): a passage from an authoritative source providing an introduction or basis; b: something providing a chief source of information or authority; c: textbook. " The fourth usage runs as follows: "4 a: TEXT HAND; b: a type considered suitable for printing running text". The fifth usage means: "5 a: a subject on which one writes or speaks; b: the form and substance of something written or spoken". The last one is: "6: the words of something (as a poem, libretto, scriptural passage, folktale) set to music". However, the evolution of the word "text", as well as the word "discourse", is so rapid that what is described about these two words in the contemporary world has gone beyond the entries in the cited dictionary. For instance, is hypertext text or discourse?

1.2   The Terms "Discourse" and "Text" in the Current Situation

Stubbs (1983: 1) defines discourse as "language above the sentence or above the clause". In this case, all language in use is discourse, but not curses, shopping lists and road signs. The concept of discourse in (critical) discourse analysis is rather chaotic, but progressively broadening one. Parker (1992: 5) treats discourse as a system of statements which constructs an object, but he reminds us that discourse analysis should go beyond any working definition and consider the role of institutions, power and ideology.

Simpkins (1998: 509) labels this tendency as the chief characteristic of postsemiotics or social semiotics. Postsemiotics mainly refers to the studies of signs after Saussure. The phrase "after Saussure", in my understanding, at least has two meanings: the models of signs based on Saussure, or the models of signs against Saussure. The models based on Saussure are not traumatic, but the models against Saussure are difficult to understand. For instance, Derrida's model of signs is just the one in this aspect. As to this point, the shortages of the Saussurean model compared with the Peircean model will be provided in Chapter 5.

Recalled to its etymology, discourse may mean a single utterance or at most a conversation between two persons. However, this single utterance or conversation always takes place in the society, and is always uttered by the concrete social individuals. It is impossible for language to exist in empty vacuum. Therefore, both the single utterance and the conversation are language in use. From this angle, it is quite reasonable to agree with Chouliaraki and Fairclough's (1999) classification of CDA into social science, that is, CDA should go beyond itself in order to reveal the hidden meaning of a text and validate its theoretical foundation. As regards this effort, Hawarth's classification of concepts of discourse will serve as a checklist, in this book, to understand the concept of discourse in circulation.

Hawarth (2000: 3 – 5) claims that there are at least five different concepts of discourse in

social science.

The first is positivists or empiricists' view of discourse. In this conception, discourses are best regarded as "frames" or "schemata", by which they mean the conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective actions. The definition of this sort is fashionable in the studies of the relationships between cognition and ideology (Dirven et al. 2001). For instance, Lakoff (2001: 37) says:

> since language reflects our conceptual systems, it will reflect the social aspects of our conceptual systems. Thus, seeing language from a cognitive perspective entails seeing language from a social perspective.

When asked how to relate this concept of language to ideology, and whether ideology is a synonym for "system of ideas", he (ibid, p. 37) replies: "That's not quite right. Any ideology is a conceptual system of a particular kind, including a moral system". For him, ideologies have both conscious and unconscious aspects. The task of cognitive linguists is to reveal the unconscious, hidden part. This concept of ideology is similar to the concept given by van Dijk (1997b). However, when we compare Lakoff's statement with Volosinov's (see Section 2 in this chapter), and agree with the latter's view, one point is missing in Lakoff's view, that is, language not only reflects the reality, but also *refracts* another reality.

Hawarth's second category, in contrast to the first, refers to the realist account of discourse. The emphasis is on the ontological dimension of discourse theory and analysis. The theory of Bhaskar (1986, 1989, 1991), as the main representative of critical realism, is crucial to the ontology and epistemology of CDA. A short introduction to his theory will be given in Section 5 of this chapter.

The third among Hawarth's classification is the perspective to view discourse as an ideological system of meaning that obscures and naturalizes uneven distributions of power and resources. This suggests that discourse analysis has the critical task of exposing the mechanisms by which this deception operates, and of proposing emancipatory alternatives.

Hawarth points out that the fourth one pertains to CDA. Fairclough (1995: 73) argues:

> In using the term "discourse", I am claiming language use to be imbricated in social relations and processes which systematically determine variations in its properties, including the linguistic forms which appear in texts.

Along the line of this argument, discourse can be seen as

> a complex of three elements: social practice, discoursal practice (text production, distribution and consumption), and text, and the analysis of a specific discourse calls for analysis in each of these three