顾曰国

语言学海外自选集

语用学与话语分析研究

顾曰国 著

中国英语教育名家自选集 ■ 顾曰国语言学海外自选集

Gu Yueguo's Anthology on Linguistics

外语教学与研究出版社
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS
北京 BEIJING

顾曰国

语言学海外自选集

语用学与话语分析研究

顾曰国 著

中国英语教育名家自选集 ■ 顾曰国语言学海外自选集

Gu Yueguo's Anthology on Linguistics

外语教学与研究出版社
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS
北京 BEIJING

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

顾曰国语言学海外自选集：语用学与话语分析研究／顾曰国著．—北京：外语教学与研究出版社，2009.12
(中国英语教育名家自选集)
ISBN 978-7-5600-9243-0

Ⅰ．①顾…　Ⅱ．①顾…　Ⅲ．①英语—语言教学—文集　Ⅳ．①H319-53

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2009)第244355号

出 版 人：于春迟
选题策划：刘相东
责任编辑：段长城
执行编辑：毕　争
封面设计：袁　璐
封面题字：赵发潜
出版发行：外语教学与研究出版社
社　　址：北京市西三环北路19号(100089)
网　　址：http://www.fltrp.com
印　　刷：中国农业出版社印刷厂
开　　本：650×980　1/16
印　　张：26
版　　次：2010年3月第1版　2010年3月第1次印刷
书　　号：ISBN 978-7-5600-9243-0
定　　价：42.90元

中国英语教育名家自选集

编委会

出版前言

《中国英语教育名家自选集》丛书第一批共推出 10 本，入选作者有王宗炎、桂诗春、胡壮麟、胡文仲、戴炜栋、秦秀白、刘润清、张正东、文秋芳、刘道义等英语教育名家。第一批 10 本已于 2008 年 1 月全部出齐，在我国英语教育界获得广泛的好评。

本丛书第一批 10 本书突出了“英语教育”这一主题，所收论文都是跟英语教育和教学密切相关的。但我们发现，很多奋斗在英语教育一线的专家、学者并不一定以“英语教育”作为主要研究课题。他们当中有很多人从事语言学、文学、翻译、社会与文化、词典学、文体学或其他应用语言学分支学科的研究。本丛书第二批的视野将更为开阔，以期更加全面地反映我国英语教育名家的科研成果。例如，第二批中的第一本《钱冠连语言学自选集》收录了作者在语言学研究方法、语言哲学、语言全息论、语用学、美学语言学等方面的研究成果。第二批将是开放式的，成熟一本推出一本，直至 10 本出齐为止。

本丛书专收我国知名英语教育家的学术论文，以填补两方面的空白：1. 以英语教育名家为主线的自选集。2. 以英语教育、语言学和应用语言学为主题的系列丛书。本丛书同时入选“北京外国语大学校级自选课题项目”。本书的读者对象为英语教师、英语专业研究生、师范院校英语本科生等，可作为他们从事科研、撰写论文的参考文献。入选的文章多散见于国内外学术期刊，且时间跨度很大，读者不易觅得。自选集展示了诸位名家对英语教育及相关学科的研究脉络，汇集成丛书，将成为我国英语教育史上不可多得的史料。

与此同时，《世界应用语言学名家自选集》也已于近期由外语教学与研究出版社陆续推出，敬请读者关注。

本丛书的编写体例如下：

一、只收发表于刊物或论文集中的学术论文以及学术演讲，字数没有限制。专著中的章节一般情况下不收。

二、所收论文的语言仅限汉语和英语。

三、所收论文大多为原已发表过的文章，基本保持原貌以尊重历史的真实。文章一般注明论文发表的时间和发表刊物的名称（或论文集名）和期号（或出版社名）。文章格式也基本保持发表时的原貌。未在刊物上发

表过的文章，如演讲等，则注明对外发布（成稿）的时间、地点和场合。

四、作者可将新的观点以尾注的方式放在当篇论文的后面，表明作者目前的观点与当时有所不同。

五、书前有作者撰写的《我与中国英语教育》为自序，详细地记录了作者求学、教学、治学的经历和感悟。书后附有作者主要学术著述的目录。

中国英语教育名家自选集编委会
2009年12月18日于北京

Contents

Foreword: *Studies in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*

This book brings to the attention of Chinese readers a wide selection of the English-language publications of Gu Yueguo—publications which, although available internationally wherever library access allows, have not been sufficiently known in China. This is one great benefit the book brings. A second benefit is that, for the first time, readers are able to appreciate the remarkably bold and innovative trajectory of Gu's thought and research over a period of some twenty-five years.

As a record of one scholar's original contributions to the study of language, the book shows how Gu's investigations have progressed from pragmatics to discourse analysis and beyond. These two fields of study, often treated as separate (for example, as separate courses in university curricula), are actually closely interwoven. In fact, in Gu's thought, pragmatics, if investigated properly, merges into discourse analysis. There is no break between the two terms 'pragmatics' and 'discourse analysis' in the title, but a continuity of thinking, which can be summarized as an evolving quest for fuller and more complete explanation of language as a social phenomenon. It is the goal that Gu espouses in quoting J. L. Austin, one of the founding fathers of modern pragmatics: 'The total speech act in the total speech situation is the *only actual* phenomenon which, in the last resort, we are engaged in elucidating' (Austin 1976 [1962]: 148).

Perhaps at this point there is need for a brief definition of the terms 'pragmatics' and 'discourse analysis'. Pragmatics, as opposed to semantics, is generally considered to be the study of the meaning of language *in its context*: including what the speaker means to convey by an utterance, and what the addressee understands by it. Here the word 'utterance' by default suggests that pragmatics does not concern itself with long stretches of language—for example, dialogues with many turns, or long pieces of written prose. In fact, in the speech act theorizing of J. R. Searle—another founding father—an illocutionary act is typically a single utterance realised in a single sentence. Discourse analysis, on the other hand, typically aims to explicate longer pieces of language. This includes what conditions enable us to interpret the connection between one sentence and its successor, or one turn and another, such that we can see how the meaning of the discourse as a whole is greater than the sum of the meanings of its individual utterance units.

Although there are many variant definitions of these subfields of linguistics, it is generally accepted that discourse analysis differs from pragmatics through its extension in time. We can think of discourse analysis as 'dynamic pragmatics': according to this view pragmatics is like a snapshot view, and discourse analysis is like a motion picture. Gu uses a memorable image: '[workplace] discourse is a dynamic process like a rolling snowball'.

From another point of view, pragmatics and discourse analysis have something in common: they are both concerned with the interrelation between language and what is not language: the world of cognition, and the social world. Some linguists (the generative school, for example) have taken the view that language is an autonomous domain, and should strictly delimited from language-external factors that might influence language use. Other linguists (I suppose I am one) admit the importance of such other factors, but still focus on language as the main target of their research, not wanting to become too deeply embroiled in the complicating factors of social or psychological setting. There is also a third category, of which Gu at least in his later publications is a supreme example: those who see language as an inseparable part of a larger social reality. From this viewpoint, in keeping with Austin's motto above, in order to explicate language and language use, we cannot shut our eyes to all the complexities of the social world of action of which linguistic communication is a part, for this influences language use and the very nature of language itself. We might characterise these three positions as 'keeping the door [i.e. the door to the wide world beyond language] shut', 'keeping the door ajar' and 'opening the door wide'. The last viewpoint, which wholeheartedly expands the territory of language use to embrace the extralinguistic world, may called the *expansionist* view. Discussing those who have reworked pragmatics in the light of Grice's cooperative principle, Gu declares himself to be, like me, an 'expansionist', in contrast (for example) to the 'reductionism' of Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory. If we trace the history of western linguistics over the past sixty years, we can see that expansionism has been the rule: starting with the 'micro', linguistics has become increasingly 'macro'. In the post-war world of American structuralism, the cutting edge of linguistics was in phonemics

and morphology, as the scientific empiricism of those days needed to make the study of language as much like a physical (viz. acoustic) science as possible. Meaning was beyond the pale. Then, the 1950s saw the emergence of the Chomskyan focus on syntax, and linguistics for a while aspired to be a mathematical science. The sixties saw the emergence of semantics, for the grammatical forms of syntax are ultimately inseparable from their meanings. In the seventies (during the fierce debate between generative and interpretive semantics), it was found that meaning as an abstract phenomenon was virtually impossible to insulate from the universe that language refers to, including the world of the utterance situation populated by speakers, hearers, and the like. So pragmatics made its way into the limelight, oddly enough, ushered in by ordinary language philosophers (especially Austin, Grice and Searle) who either ignored the up-and-coming discipline of linguistics, or had rather little to say about it. It almost seemed as if linguistics was becoming a branch of philosophy.

But in the eighties linguistics was becoming a more mature discipline which could stand on its own two feet without mimicking any other branch of knowledge. Linguistics became increasingly split between the generativists and the non-generativists, and for the latter, discourse analysis, in its various guises, became a primary focus of interest. Thus towards the end of the century, it became obvious that far from being an autonomous scientific discipline, linguistics was by its very nature interdisciplinary. The expansionist programme meant that a growing number of linguists could no longer ignore the social world in which discourse takes place. Gu takes us further along this route than most, embracing language-in-context in a comprehensive theory of *situated* discourse—i. e. language use in its total social situation.

It is fascinating, in this book, to follow the steps its author has taken on this pilgrimage, using persuasive arguments backed up by careful analysis of data.

The first article in the book 'The impasse of perlocution' is one of the most impressive. Starting with Austin's well-known analysis of speech in terms of three kinds of acts—locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary, Gu argues that the perlocution, linking an utterance to its effects, has been inappropriately neglected just because it take us into the reality beyond language. However, he points out that, leaving aside exceptional cases, a speaker cannot perform a *perlocutionary act*: for example, an perlocution of persuasion cannot be performed by the speaker alone, but is in fact a combination of two acts: the utterance by the speaker and the uptake by the addressee, which is in fact an extralinguistic act, whether we consider it to be performed mentally or physically. Hence persuasion is a form of interaction, and even the simplest dialogue lets in a chink of light from the open door leading to the world beyond language. A perlocution is something shared by speaker and hearer—a transaction, in fact.

Here we note how a subtle analysis of one of the categories of 'traditional' pragmatics leads Gu to redefine the perlocution not as a single utterance act, but as a conversational exchange: he calls this move 'rhetorical' rather than 'pragmatic', and the move from pragmatics towards discourse analysis is already under way.

Two key concepts in the enlargement of domain of inquiry are *goal* and *act*. Gu (correctly, I believe) sees human communication as essentially goal-oriented, and so the analysis of goal development explains why we say what we say, and what gives discourse its dynamic quality. Goal-driven behaviour is rarely static. I espoused a goal-oriented view of pragmatics in the book *Principles of Pragmatics* (1983), but Gu has taken this much further. Goals, of course, are closely related to intentions. The notion of intention is central to Grice's definition of meaning$_{nn}$ (Grice 1957) which is often considered the foundation stone of pragmatics. In this sense, goals are an unavoidable ingredient to the pragmatic enterprise, and the reconstruction of goals is the key to how we make sense of other people's communications. But Gu has expanded a goal-oriented view of language use to embrace a goal-oriented view of human behaviour. He has elaborating goal analysis to include multiple goals, both simultaneous and sequential, and the interacting goals of different human agents. In this way, he has shown how analysis of goal development is one of the keys to human behaviour in dialogue situations. His brilliant article 'Five ways of handling a bedpan' shows how even apparently simple communicative situations can have quite elaborate and varied goal architectures.

'Goal' and 'act(ion)' are of course closely related concepts. We typically perform actions (including speech acts) in pursuit of goals. Hence, in developing the theory of action in relation to both communicative and non-communicative behaviour, Gu again pushes forward the frontiers of pragmatics and discourse analysis, towards an all-embracing account of situated discourse.

The research programme represented by these chapters are also all-embracing in another sense. Gu's interests embrace both the theoretical and

the empirical, data-oriented poles of investigation. In this volume his theoretical modelling of situated discourse is richly illustrated by practical, authentic instances of discourse, including (for example) service encounters between salespersons and customers, family get-togethers, discourse involving medical staff and patients, administrative committee meetings, and lastly (and most fascinatingly) the discourse of *guanxi* or 'backdoor practice', where members of the public employ covert strategies to circumvent the decision-making of officialdom.

Where did all these examples come from? Here I must pay tribute to Gu's imaginative and wholehearted engagement in the rather new field of corpus linguistics, and his leadership in building up a remarkable electronic corpus under the aegis of the Chinese Academy of Social Science: the Spoken Chinese Corpus of Situated Discourse (SCCSD). Defined and comprehensively sampled according to temporal and spatial parameters, as well as typologies of workplace and private activity types, this corpus is a representative 'map' of discourse in Beijing: a concrete embodiment of Gu's all-embracing theoretical approach to situated discourse. More remarkable still, it is multi-modal corpus, where the linguistic discourse is recorded in video and audio media, and annotated for non-linguistic as well as linguistic phenomena. This is, to my knowledge, the most advanced corpus in existence, putting in the shade all those corpora, however large, which have reduced the record of discourse to the impoverished 'bare bones' of orthographic text. Corpus linguistics by tradition and convenience has represented language use, written and spoken, in the form of written text. Showing the limitations of this, Gu's corpus work is a justifiable critique of the corpus linguistics mainstream by demonstrating that to be authentic, spoken discourse should be represented by the auditory and visual record of the speech event, to which transcription is secondary.

I will conclude this foreword on a more personal note. I take pride in the fact that it was my own department at Lancaster University, in the 1980s, that introduced Gu, as a graduate student, to the newly burgeoning fields of pragmatics and corpus linguistics. But he has advanced those fields far beyond what I could have imagined them developing into at that time. When corpus linguistics began to take off, in the mid-1980s, I found I had to abandon my research in pragmatics for twenty years, to devote my attention to this new and time-consuming field. I could not simultaneously work in these two fields, which seemed to be on divergent paths. Gu has managed to develop both, together with his situated discourse analysis, side by side. Moreover, he has brought them into a convergent path: the SCCSD is a corpus well-designed for pragmatics and discourse analysis. It is hard to believe that so much has been achieved in twenty-five years. And this research programme promises to achieve much more in the future.

Geoffrey Leech,
Lancaster University
24 July 2009

References

Austin, J. L. (1976 [1962]) *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grice, H. P. (1957) 'Meaning'. *Philosophical Review* 66: 377-388.

Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

自　序

承蒙外语教学与研究出版社的错爱，邀请自编海外论文选集，以飨国内同仁学者。文集对国内同仁有无参考价值，本人不敢妄言，读者最有发言权。不过有一点是肯定的，把散见于海外出版物上的东西放在一起，可以省去读者自寻之苦，岂不美哉！

本集责编刘相东先生要我在集首写篇求学、治学感言，颇感为难，窃以为实在无话可说。拖了近一年，刘先生执意，盛情难却，再拖下去，太不恭了。

一、迈入语言学研究之路

本人走上研究语言学的道路，可以说是谋事在人，成事在天。幼年读小学时适逢"文化大革命"，除《毛主席语录》外，其他书籍一律不让卖。是时家父开书店，不让卖的书封面封底一撕，扔在后面的书库里。书库对门便是我们家。家父因怕我们上街被武斗打死，时常把我和双胞胎弟弟锁在书库里。我们因此便有了免费的图书馆。当时无论是大人书还是小人书，统统翻一翻，大多数书是犹如猪八戒吃人参果，读而不知所云。不过有一点仍然记忆犹新，那就是长大了想当个作家，写些像《钢铁是怎样炼成的》这样的小说！

到了中学时代，幼年的梦想似乎变得更现实些了。时逢"右倾翻案"，学校开始鼓励读书学习，本人跟许多同学一样开始笃信"学好数理化，走遍天下都不怕"，很快就迷上了无线电。其后邓小平再次被打倒，本人高中也毕业了，便加入了下乡知青的洪流。

在农村接受贫下中农再教育的同时，我开始通过无线电收音机收听广播英语。这可以说是我学习语言学的启蒙阶段。之前，用母语说、写，犹如听人唱歌、用筷子吃饭那样自然，很少关注其内在的构成。学外语情形就不同了，总让你感到外语很奇怪，"老外"怎么会这样说话，逼着你开始注意起语法来。不过当时学英语是为了消磨时光，从来就没有想过要学语言学，以研究语言作为一生的职业。

"文革"结束后高考恢复了。学无线电的夙愿再次燃起。因加试英语后矮子里面挑壮丁，我被安徽大学外语系录取，读"英语特种绝密专业"。这是"文革"时期设的专业，就是给国家的一些机要部门培养英语口译和笔译的人才。我们进校后这个"文革"的遗留专业也就不了了之了。

上大学跟在农村接受再教育相比，可以说是进了天堂。读书跟面朝黄土背朝天相比，是不折不扣的享受！1978 年国家恢复研究生教育，翌

年本人便报考本校研究生，被录取为英美语言文学研究生。“语言文学”是专业设置名称，在当时还没有设语言学专业。我们的研究生课程没有开语言学课，全部是英美文学。学习不到两年，颇感吃力。主要原因是觉得文艺评论不讲逻辑，用现在的流行话说，全是跟着感觉走。我总是找不到感觉。由此给自己下了判决书，本人不是学文学的料。幼年想当作家不过是自不量力、不知天高地厚的梦想罢了。

我开始认真读语言学著作，是 1981 年。第一本中文著作是陈望道的《修辞学发凡》，第一本英文语言学著作是 J. Corbett 的 *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*。这两个“第一”终生难忘。在此之前，也读过不少用中文写的关于英语的语法书，然而读这些语法书时，不是作为语言学书来读的，是作为学好英语的工具而死啃的。读上面的两本修辞学书时，情形完全不同了，眼睛睁大了，有点开窍，朦胧意识到这是另外一片天地。

我真正下决心学语言学，以研究语言作为一生的追求，是在 1982 年。是时我已经在安徽师范大学任教。一天在图书馆里看到了 G. N. Leech 教授的 *Semantics*，便爱不释手，反复阅读，从此便暗暗下定了决心，语言学是我的兴趣所在。自那以后，业余时间几乎全部用于读语言学的书籍。

1983 年国家组织出国进修考试，我有幸被录取后便申请去英国 Lancaster 大学，追随 Leech 教授攻读语言学。1984 年秋终于如愿以偿，面对面见到了这位语言学大师。如果说上大学是我一生中的第一个里程碑的话，那么 Leech 教授接受我做他的硕士、博士研究生，是我一生中的第二个里程碑。

在 Lancaster 大学读书期间，我对语用学和话语分析产生了浓厚的兴趣。话语分析在历史渊源上就是古老的修辞学。非常遗憾的是，当今，修辞学在欧洲已经衰落，被话语分析所取代。在欧洲 Leech 教授是对修辞学仍有研究的少数几位语言学家之一。我的硕士论文地地道道地是属于语用学范围，而博士论文则是把语用学、修辞学和话语分析集成为一体的研究。这跟 Leech 教授当时的研究兴趣基本上是一致的。

1988 年我在驻英使馆的安排下回国，到北京外国语大学外国语言研究所从事博士后研究，师从许国璋教授。之前我跟许老并不相识，也从未有过书信往来。也许是天意，我跟许老可以说是一见如故。他的国学和西学功底之厚让我折服。记得刚到所里，许老是名副其实的三日一小宴，七日一大宴，用的不是公款，而是他掏的个人腰包！

回眸所走过的学术道路，有四位不可或缺的领路人，那就是我的四位老师。大学期间的吴娴华，研究生期间的杨巩祚，还有就是上面提到的 Leech 和许国璋。他们有个共同特点，就是待学生如学友、挚友，家里人，是平等对话者。吴娴华老师虽年过花甲，我们见面时她还是用她给我起的绰号“老马”叫我。记得 1980 年春节，因囊中羞涩没有回家，杨先生命他的儿子冒着大雪寻我到他家过年。1985 年春节我在英国。一天我在信箱里摸到一个信封，是 Leech 教授留给我的。打开一看，里面有张购书券，还附着个便条，歪歪斜斜有三个汉字：压岁钱！1990 年，准确的日子我已经记不清了，当时我住在北外西院 18 号楼 602 房间。听到有人敲门，没想到站在门外的是提着篮子的许国璋先生。他听说我病了，特地给我买了点菜，顺便来看望我！是时他已经 73 岁。这些老师通过言传身教让我明白了一个最基本的道理，那就是要想做好学问，首先要学会做人。

二、语言研究之道

说起语言研究之道，我有一些不入流的体会。记得 1982 年我第一次发表“论文”。拿到了有我文章的杂志和随后寄来的稿酬，虽然表面上还显得谦虚，心底里自鸣得意许久，飘飘然自以为成了“家”。英国留学生活给我带来的最大收获之一是知道了天有多高，地有多厚！再读当年的一些所谓“论文”，恨不得钻地缝。问题出在哪里呢？我那时把读书加上对其归纳总结所形成的文字等同于论文，而实际上充其量只能算是研究工作的一部分。对前人的研究在文献上做严肃的梳理工作，分析其优劣得失，是研究任何一个语言学课题所必须做的。但是做到这一点不等于论文，只能作为论文中“先前研究文献回顾”这一部分的内容。在前人研究的基础上超出前人的地方才真正算是自己的东西。

在国内一些学术交流会上，立志研究西方现代语言学理论、特别是语用学和话语分析的年轻学者，往往问我应该读些什么书，如何在国外学术期刊上发表论文等问题。本人的体会是，读专业著作自然不用说，而读相关专业的书往往比读专业书还重要。这是因为西方的当代语用学和话语分析，在知识结构上都是建筑在相邻学科之上的，比如语言分析哲学、数理逻辑、古典社会学、法兰克福批判社会学、社会心理学、符号学等。假如不读这类书籍，研究西方语用学和话语分析就很难深入下去，无法跟西方学者进行平等的对话。做不到平等对话，在他们主编的杂志上发表论文，自然就十分困难了。我现在读书花时间最多的都是在读相关专业的书上，收获特别大。因为这使得我能够从不同的角度看西方学者在语言学方面的最新成果，不但容易理解他们的思想，同时也能看出他们研究的漏洞。俗话说，旁观者清嘛。能够指出他们的不足，同时提出自己的观点的文章，肯定能够被接受和发表。

怎样才能做到“山高我为峰”呢？我以为最终的答案要在语言事实中去寻觅。再好的理论，再好的假设，经不住语言事实的检验，最终必

定是要被淘汰的。创新不能成为鼓励狂妄的托词；大胆假设必须建立在对前人研究熟烂于心的基础之上，精密求证是把大胆假设上升为理论的必由之路。必须指出，本文集里的文章并没有达到我给自己定的要求。聊以自慰的是自 1990 年起本人便着手构建现场即席话语语料库，时至今日，已经有了相当大的规模。我虽已年过不惑，仍雄心勃勃地学习计算机编程语言和数据建模语言，现在盘点一下，收获极大，使我想起 30 多年前在农村劳动时农民老大爷常说的一句话：磨刀不误砍柴工！

三、本选集概说

本选集共收录论文 13 篇。论文的原发刊物在版权鸣谢页里已逐一注明，此处无需赘言。在内容上，这 13 篇拙文可分为两大部分，理论探索部分（计 9 篇）和旨在研究汉语的洋为中用部分（计 4 篇）。这些文章无论是理论探索，还是实践应用，都围绕一个问题——即语言交际和社会活动的交互关系。这个问题乍听起来好像没什么大不了，很容易回答。为消除故弄玄虚之嫌，在此交待一下论文形成的西方学术背景是很有必要的。

我们知道语用学顾名思义是研究语言使用的学问。如何来研究语言使用？在西方，研究的主流思路是把语言使用看作是人们用语言来进行信息交流的一种活动。也就是说语用学的核心问题成了如何阐释语言是怎样被用来进行信息交流的。语用学家不是不知道语言不仅仅被用来进行信息交流，当然还有其他用途。而语用学的主流思想坚持认为，语用学不可能什么都研究，研究者得划个范围，有所侧重。结果便是，语用学范围就被圈定在对语言信息——被分解成各种意义，诸如话面意义，默认意义，会话含义，一般性会话含义等等——的理解上，超出这个范围的就不属语用学了，由话语分析去解决。

把语用学跟语言的信息交际绑定在一起的这个思路产生了一系列的连锁效应。

（一）映射到言语行为研究上时，则表现在对施事行为（the illocutionary act）和取效行为（the perlocutionary act）的处理上。我们知道施事行为和取效行为是 Austin 所说的“完整言语行为”（the total speech act）的有机组成部分。主流观点是：施事行为当然属于语用学的研究范围，而取效行为则应排除在外。也就是说，Austin 定义的完整言语行为里的一部分划归语用学，另外一部分则打入另册。理由是取效行为超出了语言交际的范围。拙文 The Impasse of Perlocution（见本选集第 1 篇）就是针对取效行为的地位、哲学基础、研究方法和存在的问题展开论述的。

（二）映射到 Grice 的会话理论上时，则表现在对 Grice 的一些重要

概念的处理上，它们是 utterance，talk exchange，transaction，meaning 以及 cooperation。Grice 所说的 utterance 是一个广义的概念，包括语言行为和非语言行为，即用口说出一句话是 utterance，用身体做个动作也是 utterance。用语用学跟语言的信息交际绑定的尺度来衡量，Grice 的用身体来做的 utterance 自然就被排除在语用学的范围之外了。talk exchange 顾名思义是谈话双方你来我往一个回合才构成一个 talk exchange。talk exchange 固然是语言交际活动，但是如果把语用学限定在语言信息的理解这个层面上，那么 talk exchange 也就超出了语用学的范围，溢入到话语分析里去了。

再看 Grice 的 transaction。这概念似乎引自经济学。在经济学里，一手交钱一手交货构成一个 transaction。transaction 是一种合作形式。在 Grice 的理论框架里，一手交钱是一个 utterance，一手交货也是 utterance。两个加在一起构成一个 transaction 很自然。talk exchange 也是一种 transaction，所不同是交换的不是物，而是言词和信息。

再看 Grice 的 meaning$_{nn}$，他提出这个概念是要解决非自然意义是如何产生和被理解的问题。语言交际所涉及的意义属于非自然意义。对自然语言的意义的理解是语用学最关注的核心问题，自然引发了大量的研究。所谓的 Neo-Grice 理论、关联理论都是在这个领域提出来的。需要指出的是无论是 Neo-Grice 理论，还是关联理论，都是在对 Grice 的原始框架做出修正之后提出来的，即研究者要么无视 Grice 的 utterance，talk exchange，transaction 的本意，要么明确做出修正。他们对 Grice 的 meaning$_{nn}$ 的修正主要表现在把听话人的反应（相当于 Austin 的取效行为的效果）排除在语言信息理解的机制之外。

最后来看 Grice 的 cooperation。前面的 talk exchange 和 transaction 都是以 cooperation 为基础的。Grice 所关心的不是真正意义上的 cooperation，即实际上的一手交钱一手交货，而是对人类理性行为（rational behavior）的推理过程的理性构建。我想买你的东西，你想卖你的东西。我和你的理性告诉我们，如果我们都想达到各自的目的，我们最好合作，因为这样对我们双方都是有益的。这就是理性行为的理性推理。Grice 的 Cooperative Principle（合作原则）受到多方的攻击，有些是合理的，有些则是建立在误解之上的。

拙文 Pragmatics and rhetoric: A collaborative approach to conversation 和 Towards a multiple-goal neo-Grice（本选集第 2、3 两篇论文）着重探讨把语用学跟语言信息交际绑定在一起所产生的一系列后果。上一篇和这两篇加在一起，试图向西方语用学界证明以下观点。

（一）把 Austin 的取效行为排除出去，对 Grice 几个核心概念的修正，所付出的代价是，Austin 和 Grice 原来的框架被肢解了，语用学

名义上研究语言的使用，经过上面这些操作之后，实际上研究的不是实实在在的使用，而是对其理想化改造后的使用。语用学一旦面对语言实际时，就不得不声称这个超出其研究范围，便心安理得地撒手不管了。本人的观点是，这样处理只有在方法论上有其合理性，在语言使用的实际面前就失去其合理性了。

（二）面对语言使用的实际情况，语用学要么改造自己，要么就得跟其他学科协作。本人提出的方案是跟其他学科合作，即跟 rhetoric 和 discourse analysis 协作。

（三）在 Austin 的 total speech act 理论和 Grice 的 utterance，talk exchange 以及 transaction 思想里，语言使用和社会活动是交织在一起的，语言的实际使用情况正是如此。这就是说，用信息交际理论作为研究语言使用的基本出发点和理论基础是不够的，因为语言使用和社会活动是交织在一起的，这就需要一个普通行为理论作为更为基本的理论架构来处理语言使用中的复杂情况。

用哲学和社会学里关于普通行为的理论来构建一个分析框架，用于处理语言在实际使用中的复杂情况就是本选集第 4、5、6 篇论文的任务。三篇论文分别为 Five ways of handling a bedpan（第 4 篇，可译为“便壶处置五法”），Towards a model of situated discourse analysis（第 5 篇，可译为“现场即席话语分析模型初探”），Towards an understanding of workplace discourse（第 6 篇，可译为“工作现场话语解析”）。“便壶处置五法”一文的题目乍读起来有点不登大雅之堂。它实际上是暗仿 Austin 的题为 Three ways of spilling ink 的这篇哲学论文。Austin 这篇论文的功力在于小中见大。本文试图效仿之。本人在协和医院住院期间，因特殊情况在 2 小时内收录到了不同护士对病人要便壶这样同一件事的五种处置方式。由此提出了现场即席话语分析的三维分析法，即行为目的的延展分析、话语交互延展分析和人际关系运作分析。“现场即席话语分析模型初探”和“工作现场话语解析”这两篇论文对三维分析法作了更进一步的演绎和增补。增补的内容是引进人文地理学关于时空间、特别是社会时空间的理论，用于解决现场即席话语跟物理时空间和社会时空间之间的扎根问题。

第 7、8 两篇论文是关于多模态文本分析的。所谓多模态文本指转写文字文本、音频流文本和视频流文本同步集成的复合型文本。第 7 篇 Multimodal text analysis: A corpus linguistic approach to situated discourse 要解决两个问题：一是如何通过计算机来处理多模态文本；二是如何对多模态文本的内容（即摄像所捕捉到的现场即席话语活动）进行数据建模。第 8 篇 An institutional anniversary ceremony as systemic behavior in Chinese context 是利用多模态文本所捕捉到的信息探讨在现场即席话语

活动中个体行为跟集体行为之间的互动关系。

第 7、8 两篇论文跟前面各篇的相同点是都把研究的焦点放在“现场即席话语活动”上。这本质上是为 Austin 所认定的、而他自己未能深入研究的 the total speech act in the total speech situation 找到一个分析和描述的元语言和方法。而后两篇不同于前面各篇的地方表现在话语数据的类型上。前面各篇的话语数据是写下来的书面文字，而后两篇的话语数据主要是视频流。

第一部分的最后一篇论文（第 9 篇）是关于语言的约定俗成的最新研究成果的综述类论文。该文的主要观点是，语用在先，语义和句法是语用的沉淀和固化，就是通常说的约定俗成。沉淀和固化的机制和过程是个什么样子呢？该文把当前的一些主要观点做了综合评述。

第二部分是针对现代汉语所进行的语用学和话语分析研究。Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese（第 10 篇）研究现代汉语中的礼貌现象。Doctor-patient interaction as goal-directed discourse in Chinese sociocultural context（第 11 篇）研究医生和病人之间的互动。需要提醒读者注意的是，discourse 在这里是个术语，不是一个普通的英语词。它跟 interaction 是同外延的，在这一点上 discourse 和 interaction 可以说是同义。所不同的是 discourse 强调互动中的语言要素。Goal-directedness 在英语里有着非常丰富的哲学、人工智能、行为理论等方面的内涵，而在汉语里却缺乏这些内涵，所以很难翻译成中文。它是一般行为理论中的核心概念之一。第 12 篇 Chinese officialdom（*guan*）at work in discourse，和第 13 篇 *Guanxi*: Backdoor practice as goal-directed discourse 都是分析权力和话语的关系。

四、问题和不足

本选集所录的论文前后时间跨度是从 1990 到 2009。由于都保留了发表时的原样，加上本选集只收录了部分论文，有些论文跟本选集中的论文虽然关系更紧密，但由于版权和其他原因没有收录，读者会发现各篇之间在内容连贯上很不好。在此我只能恳请读者谅解。为了对此缺陷作些弥补，文章在前后顺序上没有按发表的年代排列，而是按文章主题之间的相关性排序。另外，第二部分针对汉语做的语用学和话语分析，现在看来很不深入，数据也不充实。近几年来做了一些基于语料库的研究，质量有所提高。待日后版权期限过后再收集成册，为读者查阅与评判提供方便。

鸣　谢

作者由衷感谢下列刊物允许转载下列文章。

The impasse of perlocution. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1993, No. 20, pp. 405-432.

Pragmatics and rhetoric: A collaborative approach to conversation. In Herman Par-rate, ed., 1993. *Pretending to Communicate*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 173-195.

Towards a multiple-goal neo-Grice. *International Journal of Pragmatics*, 2003, Vol. 14, pp. 45-70.

Five ways of handling a bedpan: A tripartite approach to workplace discourse. *Text*, 1997, 17(4), pp. 457-475.

Towards a model of situated discourse analysis. In Ken Turner, ed., 1999. *The Semantics and Pragmatics Interface*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publisher, pp. 149-178.

Towards an understanding of workplace discourse: A pilot study for compiling a spoken Chinese corpus of situated discourse. In Christopher Candlin, ed., 2002. *Research and Practice in Professional Discourse*. Hong Kong: The City University of Hong Kong Press, pp. 137-185.

Multimodal text analysis: A corpus linguistic approach to situated discourse. *Text and Talk*, 2006, 26(2), pp. 127-167.

An institutional anniversary ceremony as systemic behavior in Chinese context. In Bruce Fraser & Ken Turner, eds., 2009. *Studies in Pragmatics*. London: Emerald.

Conventions of language. In Jef Verschuren, Jan-Ola Osman, Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen, eds., 2005. *Handbook of Pragmatics* 2003-2005. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publ. Co, pp. 1-48.

Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1990, No. 3, pp. 237-257.

Doctor-patient interaction as goal-directed discourse. *Journal of Asian*

Pacific Communication, 1996, Vol. 7, Nos 3 &4, pp. 156-176.

Chinese officialdom (*guan*) at work in discourse. In Colin Barron, Nigel Bruce & David Nunan eds., 2002. *Knowledge and Discourse: Towards an Ecology of Language*. London: Longman.

Guanxi: Backdoor practice as goal-directed discourse. In David C. S. Li, ed., 2002. *Discourses in Search of Members: In Honour of Ron Scollon*. Lanham: University Press of America, Inc, pp. 273-298.

Part I

Theoretical Explorations

The Impasse of Perlocution*

Received March 1992; *revised version October* 1992

This paper presents an overall review of the theory of perlocution since its formulation by Austin in 1962. Among the notions dealt with are the Multiplicity Thesis, the Infinity Thesis, the Causation Thesis, the Intention Irrelevance Thesis and the Effect = Act ("effect equals act") Fallacy. It is argued that the current theory of perlocution is fundamentally misguided, and that the Causation Thesis, which is primarily responsible for the impasse of perlocutionary theory, gives rise to four problems. Also examined are the meanings of "By saying x I did y" and the dichotomy between illocution and perlocution. It holds that the perlocutionary act is not a single act, but a transaction, and calls for a fresh approach to the study of perlocutionary phenomena.

1. Introduction

Three decades or so have elapsed since Austin's initial formulation of speech act theory in 1962. His conception of the locutionary and the illocutionary acts has been scrutinized, challenged and modified (and drastically so with respect to the illocutionary act). The pertinent literature is now so well-known that it would be a cliche to cite it. The perlocutionary act, in contrast, has received the least attention. As far as I can gather, there are only four papers devoted to the topic: Cohen (1973), Campbell (1973), Gaines (1979) and Davis (1980). Peripheral discussions of it are found in

---

* This paper was originally published in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1993, No. 20, pp. 405-432, North-Holland.

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Professor G. N. Leech, Dr. Jenny Thomas, Professor Widdowson, Professor P. F. Strawson, Professor H. Parret, and to the anonymous referees of the *Journal of Pragmatics* for their invaluable comments on the manuscript. The author also thanks Philippa Jeffrey for polishing the language of the paper. All the remaining faults are of course the author's.

e.g. Black (1969), Sadock (1974), Van Dijk (1977), Bach and Harnish (1979), and Leech (1983). These efforts have contributed, in one way or another, to our understanding of the perlocutionary act. Nevertheless, there are some important issues which call for further scrutiny and criticism. This paper first identifies these issues, and then discusses the problems which are shown to have led to the impasse of the perlocutionary act. It is argued that the conception of the perlocutionary act is fundamentally misguided, and a fresh approach is called for.

2. An anatomy of perlocution

Let us first recall Austin's initial statement of the act:

> "Saying something will often, or even normally, produce certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience, or of the speaker, or of other persons..." (1980: 101)

There are four defining features discernible in Austin's conception of the act:

(1) S says something to H;

(2) H is affected in a certain way;

(3) That H is affected is treated as a consequential effect of S's saying something;

(4) S is therefore attributed with the performance of the perlocutionary act.

In what follows we take a look at the various views of these four features elaborated by Austin and his proponents/opponents.

2.1 S says something to H

It is held that perlocutionary effects can be brought off by the locutionary act, thus resulting in what Sadock (1974) calls "sense perlocution", or by the illocutionary act with or without the aid of the mediating locutionary act, thus giving rise to "force perlocution" (1974: 153). Cohen (1973: 496) even suggests the possibility that one locutionary act may give rise to several illocutionary acts, which in turn produce as many perlocutionary acts.

However, as far as the perlocutionary act is concerned, "say" need not be in its full normal sense. Austin tells us:

> "[I]t is characteristic of perlocutionary acts that the response achieved, or the sequel, can be achieved additionally or entirely by *non-locutionary*

> *means*: thus intimidation may be achieved by waving a stick or pointing a gun..." (1980: 119; emphasis mine)

Austin's nonverbal means of achieving a perlocutionary effect is generally ignored. Cohen (1973: 495) however holds that the perlocutionary act can be performed "simply by the sound I produce when I say whatever I say". Sadock exemplifies a similar view:

> "Some perlocutionary effects can be brought off independently of, or even in spite of, the meaning of an utterance, as when one yells in the ear of a sleeping person. *Don't wake up*. One can succeed in frightening someone by saying *Boo!*" (1974: 153)

It is echoed by Bach and Harnish (1979: 82): "Ll. By uttering 'Don't wake up' S awakened H".

Notice that, although "Don't wake up" is a full-blooded utterance, it functions, with respect to the perlocutionary act of awakening H, merely as acoustic sounds uttered loud enough to rouse H from his/her slumber (see 3.1 below for further analysis).

2.2 H is affected in a certain way

Austin and the others allow the following three possibilities. (1) S's saying something may produce multiple and different (though related) effects on one H. For instance, it may have some effect on H's thought apart from that on his action. (2) The number of individuals to be affected can be more than one, and the effects may differ from one individual to another. And (3) the previous two cases may co-occur. (1), (2) and (3) can be graphically represented in Fig. 1.

	S's saying something may affect			
	Effects on \ Persons affected	audience	speaker	other persons
intrapersonal	feelings and/or	+	+	+
	thoughts and/or	+	+	+
	actions	+	+	+
		interpersonal		

Figure 1

Let us call the view that S's saying something may produce multiple effects on multiple persons the *Multiplicity Thesis*. ①

Austin is also the originator of another thesis, to be called the *Infinity Thesis*. He observes:

> "For clearly any, or almost any, perlocutionary act is liable to be brought off, in sufficiently special circumstances, by the issuing, with or without calculation, of any utterance whatsoever, and in particular by a straightforward constative utterance (if there is such an animal)." (1980: 110)

Bach and Harnish restate Austin's view thus:

> "... there is virtually *no limit* to the sorts of things that can result from speech acts—*almost anything is possible*." (1979: 17; emphasis mine)

In other words there is no way to predict or tell, in view of the utterance, what the subsequent effects are; the utterance exerts *no binding force* on the effects produced.

Sadock voices another sense of limitlessness, or infinity in terms of quantity:

> "It is also characteristic that the *number* of intended perlocutionary effects associated with an utterance is *not limited*." (1974: 9; emphasis mine)

In short, the issuing of an utterance may produce an infinite and indefinite number of perlocutionary effects.

2.3 H being affected is treated as a consequential effect of S's saying something

Although H being affected is some event occurring in H, it is regarded as something caused by S's saying something. In Davis's (1980: 39) terminology, S's saying something is a "perlocutionary cause", while H being affected is a "perlocutionary effect". The view that S's saying something *causes* H being affected is termed the *Causation Thesis*. If S's saying something counting as locution or illocution or both fails to cause H being affected, it will at most constitute a perlocutionary attempt, far from

① Related to this thesis is the view that S's saying many things may jointly contribute to one effect. This many to one causal relation poses no problem nor offers any support to the Causation Thesis (to be dealt with later on). It is therefore ignored in this paper.

being a perlocutionary act. If, on the other hand, some events take place in H prior to S saying anything, these events cannot be regarded as consequential effects caused by S's saying something, and hence it will not lead to the claim that a perlocutionary act has been performed. Only when both the perlocutionary cause and the perlocutionary effect occur will S be said to have performed a perlocutionary act. The *Causation Thesis is therefore fundamental to the conception of the perlocutionary act.* Austin (1980) himself, however, nowhere elaborates it except in a footnote in Lecture IX (p. 113). The thesis has been generally acknowledged explicitly or implicitly, and elaborated in Davis (1980). No serious challenge to it has yet been made (to be examined in detail in section 3 below).

2.4 S is attributed with the performance of a perlocutionary act

Since H being affected is something caused by S, S is attributed with the performance of a perlocutionary act. This gives rise to three questions. First, how can we decide which act is to be attributed? Second, should we take S's intention into consideration? Third, what is the nature of such an attribution?

The first problem will be intractable, if we try to determine the perlocutionary acts from S's point of view. For one thing, there is no "performative formula" for S to perform the act by uttering it. For another, by the Multiplicity Thesis, we cannot infer, from what S says, what effect is to be brought about—anything is possible. Austin, being fully aware of the problem, seems to suggest a solution by the notions of "perlocutionary object" and "perlocutionary sequel". He observes (1980: 118): "the act of warning may achieve its perlocutionary object of alerting and also have the perlocutionary sequel of alarming". Cohen develops Austin's idea into what he terms "direct associated perlocution". That is, for some illocutionary acts there are certain perlocutions typically associated with them, e.g. arguing with persuading or convincing, warning with alarming, threatening with intimidating, and so on. It takes little imagination to see that the solution gets us nowhere, for it works only in a few limited cases. ①

The difficulty seems to be by-passed if we work backwards, i.e. by examining the effects produced in H. Gaines's observation that it is the

① In the majority of cases, acts like insulting sb., making sb. sad, scaring sb., do not have the so-called perlocutionary object or sequel, nor direct associated perlocutions.