

北京大学英语系教材系列

语用学

——理论及应用

姜望琪 编著

Pragmatics:

Theories &
Applications

北京大学出版社

PRAGMATICS :

THEORIES AND APPLICATIONS

语用学——理论及应用

姜望琪 编著

北京大学出版社

2000年·北京

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语用学:理论及应用:英文/姜望琪编著. - 北京:北京大学出版社, 2000. 1

ISBN 7-301-04377-5

I. 语… II. 姜… III. 语用学-英文 IV. HO

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2000)第 01151 号

书 名: 语用学——理论及应用

著作责任者: 姜望琪

责任编辑: 徐 刚

标准书号: ISBN 7-301-04377-5/H·504

出版者: 北京大学出版社

地 址: 北京市海淀区中关村北京大学校内 100871

网 址: <http://cbs.pku.edu.cn/cbs.htm>

电 话: 出版部 62752015 发行部 62754140 编辑室 62752028

电子信箱: zpup@pup.pku.edu.cn

排版者: 兴盛达激光照排中心

印刷者: 北京神剑印刷厂(原国防科工委印刷厂)

发 行 者: 北京大学出版社

经 销 者: 新华书店

850 毫米×1168 毫米 32 开本 10.25 印张 251 千字

2000 年 1 月第 1 版 2000 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

定 价: 16.00 元

献给——

我的老师

序

我是1979年在澳大利亚进修学习时首次接触语用学的。弹指二十年,目睹了语用学研究在我国的迅猛发展。有关语用学的教材、专著、论文、学术会议,在我国频频出台。我本人虽无新的建树,为同行们的每一个成就总感到无比的喜悦。就像攀登华山一样,自己在金锁关前止步不前自愧不已,唯对那些义无反顾继续向中峰、东峰、西峰挺进的勇士们却总是肃然起敬,夸不绝口的。如今,我似乎再现了这种心情。当同仁姜望琪教授将他的语用学手稿交到我手中时,我既感到它的学术分量,也共享作者登临顶峰后的喜悦心情。

《语用学——理论及应用》一书,填补了我国语用学教材,特别是高级教材的贫乏和过时。在市场经济的大潮中,能否编写和出版一部销量有限的学术性专业书籍是对作者、编者和出版社胆识的考验。一瞬间,在我眼前出现的形象不是在海边卷起裤腿的弄潮儿,而是在大海远处波涛中时隐时现的冲浪者。

外语界老前辈许国璋先生在世时曾多次表示,语言学的外语教材既要介绍国外的新动向、新成果、新思路,也要反映我国学者的认识和学术水平。《语用学——理论及应用》一书应该说是我国学者近年来向这个方向努力的一个成果。不能说,作者已经提出了自己的模式,但在本书中,作者不时比较不同观点和发表自己的远见卓识。为了方便读者阅读,作者将大量的讨论放在附注中,供有兴趣者进一步研究思考。由此展开的讨论无疑将推动我国语用学的研究。

《语用学——理论及应用》是用英语写作的。文笔通顺流畅,表达正确。这一方面让我国英语专业学生和语言学研究生有书可读,专业知识和英语水平同步提高;另一方面,必然能让国外学者了解我国语用学研究的现状和水平,推动我国语用学研究与国际接轨,我们不妨拭目以待。

最后要指出的是,姜望琪教授是在眼疾不时发作,编写工作时停时缀的困难情况下完成的。在这个意义上,《语用学——理论及应用》可谓他的呕心沥血之作。我总有这样的感觉,即使在他用眼不方便时,作者没有停止思考,本书的字里行间都闪现他深邃的思想火花。愿读者与我共享这一感受。

胡壮麟

1999年5月1日于

北京大学畅春园

自序

语用学是一门新兴学科。五十年代正式面世,六七十年代即成为显学,八九十年代又提出了新的理论。

国内自八十年代以来,不断有文章介绍语用学。许多学校相继开设了语用学课程,教科书也应运而生。本人从1992年开始为英语系研究生讲授语用学(中间因眼疾耽搁了不少时日),深感编撰一部有深度、成系统、合国情的教材迫在眉睫,因此不揣冒昧,斗胆一试。

本书不纠缠语用学的定义,而重在其研究的内容,即指称、会话含义、预设、言语行为、会话分析五个方面。其中会话含义是重点,特别是系统介绍了八九十年代提出的关联理论、新格赖斯原则。鉴于国内学者,尤其是研究生,不容易读到国外语用学原著,本书以原原本本介绍理论首创者的思想为宗旨。力求做到忠实、准确,同时尽可能简单明了。

有人以为语用学是教人用语言的。既然人人都会说话——运用语言的基本形式,那么语用学毫无用处,就是不证自明的。这其实是一种误解。语用学是研究语言运用规律的。人人都会说话不等于人人都明白其中的道理,都懂得其规律。可以毫不夸张地说,迄今为止尚无一人已明白了说话的规律,至少无人能清楚地将其表达出来。因此才有了语用学,才有了这门研究其规律的学科。

可是为什么要明白说话的规律呢?现成的答案是为了更自觉地运用这些规律,把语言运用得更巧妙。但深层次的答案涉及到语言

研究的意义,甚至一切学术研究的意义,或曰人生的意义。凡能思考者皆为人生感到疑惑。人是什么?世界是什么?这一切从哪来?又将走向何方?人类几千年文明史,就是孜孜不倦探寻其答案的历史。语言作为人类区别于他类的重要特征,甚至是关键特征,是人类本质的重要外在形式。研究其机制必将加深对人类本质的了解。在某种意义上,弄明白人类是如何运用语言的,是理解人生的第一步(这是乔姆斯基把语言学归于心理学的一个原因)。这种探索是艰难的,但人类终将逼近答案。

语用学无用论,或广义说,语言学无用论,还来自它与国计民生无关的看法。这些人忽略了一个简单的事实:倡导抽象思维、探索苹果为什么往下掉的民族成就了工业革命,领导人类飞速进入现代文明;而讲究实际、天天询问“吃了没?”的民族却遭受了百年屈辱,反而吃不上饭。貌似最远的路却是真正的捷径,这就是辩证法。万丈高楼起自千尺地下,似乎南辕北辙,实际欲擒故纵,反之则欲速不达。人工智能计算机的研制计划数十年前就宣布了,但至今仍无重大突破。为什么?症结不在计算机科学,在语言学。在于我们还不清楚语言机制,更谈不上成功地形式化描写语言,以致计算机无法理解传递人类智慧的工具——自然语言。

基于上述考虑,本书以相当篇幅阐述各种语用学理论,讨论各自的解释语言运用的能力。当然,理论是不能脱离实际的。它来自实际,为了解决实际问题而提出;它还原实际,以其解决实际问题的能力被取舍。因此本书副标题的第二部分是“应用”。讨论理论时的各种例句都是应用的尝试,但集中讨论应用的是最后一章——会话分析。这是本书照搬莱文森(Levinson 1983),把这一题目包括进来的根本原因。

历经数载,终于草就。本人辛苦,自不必说;众人相助,亦不可少。本书是献给我的老师的,没有他们便没有本书。我感谢我的老师,所有的老师,小学的、中学的、大学的,中国的、外国的,教过我

的、没教过我的，年长的、年轻的。但在这里，我只能具体提及曾给予本书直接帮助的师友。而且不是全部，只是主要的几位。首先是胡壮麟教授，他是向国内介绍语用学的第一人。当我跟他谈起自己的写作意图时，他欣然答应为我作序，并把自己收集多年的资料全部赠送与我，其中包括奥斯汀的 *How to Do Things with Words*。他还利用在香港讲学的机会，为我复印了两本最新的外国教材。在我写完后，他又在百忙中拨冗阅读了手稿，提出了许多中肯的意见。钱军博士在哈佛做研究时，抽出宝贵时间为我复印了国内找不到的资料。中文系索振羽教授也在写语用学教材，但他毫无保留地向我讲述了他的写作计划。我们在一起探讨了一些有争议的问题，我从中获益非浅。北外刘润清教授曾帮我从他们学校借书，并赠送了他的新作。北大英语系复印室张连敏老师，资料室蔡润、王志会、张燕敏老师为搜集资料提供了不少方便，在此一并致谢。最后，没有北大出版社胡双宝编审、郭力主任的鼎力相助，本书是不可能出版的。责任编辑徐刚为本书付出了艰辛的劳动。我感谢他们，感谢一切帮助过我的朋友。

Contents

序(胡壮麟)	I
自序	III
1 Introduction	(1)
1.1 An informal definition	(1)
1.2 The origin of pragmatics	(2)
1.2.1 The term "pragmatics"	(3)
1.2.2 Semiotics	(4)
1.2.3 Pragmatism	(6)
1.2.4 Semiotic pragmatics	(8)
2 Deixis	(11)
2.1 The egocentricity of deixis	(12)
2.2 Different uses	(14)
2.2.1 Gestural and symbolic uses	(14)
2.2.2 Deictic and anaphoric uses	(15)
2.3 Types of deixis	(20)
2.3.1 Person deixis	(20)
2.3.2 Time deixis	(25)
2.3.3 Place deixis	(28)
2.3.4 Discourse deixis	(29)

2.3.5	Social deixis	(31)
3	Conversational implicature (I)	(34)
3.1	The Gricean theory	(34)
3.1.1	The cooperative principle	(35)
3.1.2	Violation of the maxims	(43)
3.2	Elaborations on the theory	(55)
3.2.1	Characteristics of conversational implicature	(55)
3.2.2	Entailment	(60)
3.2.3	Conventional implicature	(62)
3.2.4	Distinctions within conversational implicature	(65)
3.3	Formalization of implicature	(71)
3.3.1	Scalar quantity implicature	(71)
3.3.2	Clausal quantity implicature	(80)
4	Conversational implicature (II)	(86)
4.1	Relevance theory	(86)
4.1.1	Ostensive-inferential communication	(88)
4.1.2	Relevance	(96)
4.1.3	Differences between the Gricean theory and relevance theory	(103)
4.2	The Q- and R-principles	(110)
4.2.1	Wherefore the principles	(110)
4.2.2	Evidence for the principles	(117)
4.3	The Q-, I- and M-principles	(128)
4.3.1	A neoclassic interpretation	(129)
4.3.2	Anaphoric reference	(136)
4.3.3	Some alternative approaches	(148)

5	Presupposition	(161)
5.1	The philosophical tradition	(161)
5.2	A semantic analysis	(166)
5.2.1	Presupposition vs. focus	(166)
5.2.2	As a type of lexical information	(169)
5.2.3	Factive and non-factive	(171)
5.2.4	Presupposition-triggers	(173)
5.3	Problems in the semantic approach	(177)
5.3.1	Defeasibility	(177)
5.3.2	The projection problem	(179)
5.4	The pragmatic approach	(182)
5.4.1	Holes, plugs and filters	(182)
5.4.2	Potential and actual presuppositions	(187)
5.4.3	A principled account	(190)
6	Speech acts	(197)
6.1	The performative-constative dichotomy	(198)
6.1.1	Early development	(198)
6.1.2	Felicity conditions	(201)
6.1.3	Collapse of the dichotomy	(203)
6.2	The theory of illocutionary acts	(206)
6.2.1	Three kinds of speech act	(206)
6.2.2	Some counter-arguments	(209)
6.3	Classes of illocutionary acts	(213)
6.3.1	Austin's classification	(213)
6.3.2	Searle's revision	(217)
6.4	A semanticist view	(224)
6.4.1	The performative hypothesis	(224)
6.4.2	A detailed examination	(226)

6.5	Indirect speech acts	(239)
6.5.1	A pragmatic analysis	(240)
6.5.2	Idiomatic, but not idioms	(245)
7	Conversation analysis	(248)
7.1	Turn-taking	(249)
7.1.1	Rules for turn-taking	(250)
7.1.2	The significance of the rules	(255)
7.2	Adjacency pairs	(259)
7.2.1	Insertion sequences	(260)
7.2.2	Three-turn structures	(263)
7.3	Preference organization	(266)
7.3.1	Preference in repair	(266)
7.3.2	Preferred and dispreferred seconds	(269)
7.4	A neo-Gricean interpretation	(277)
7.4.1	Pre-sequences	(277)
7.4.2	Minimization in conversation	(282)
7.5	Searle on conversation	(285)
7.5.1	The structure of conversation	(285)
7.5.2	Turn-taking "rules"	(290)
	Appendix: transcription conventions	(294)
	Bibliography	(295)

Chapter 1: Introduction

Pragmatics is a newly arising discipline. Its English name was only invented in 1937 and its first major theory, Speech Act Theory, did not take shape until the 50s. But it has been developing rapidly. By the early 80s, pragmatics had been generally accepted as one of the basic branches of linguistics together with phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics.^①

1.1 An informal definition

Pragmatics has been defined in many different ways.^② But no at-

① It has to be said that this is a moderate view. There are less moderate views on the relation between linguistics and pragmatics. H. Haberland and J. Mey, the first editors of *Journal of Pragmatics*, for instance, in their editorial of the first issue (1977: 9) argue that "linguistics is pragmatic or it is not". "[D]oing pragmatics, in our sense, is simply doing linguistics, and vice versa. The pragmatic 'aspect' can neither be separated from linguistics 'proper', or even postponed, or added on as a new component. Pragmatics, far from being an aspect of the linguist's work, is its very essence." Jef Verschueren, Secretary General of the International Pragmatics Association, also advocates "a radical departure from the established component view which tries to assign to pragmatics its own set of linguistic features in contradistinction with phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics". In his opinion, "pragmatics does not belong to the contrast set of these 'horizontal' components of the study of language, neither does it belong to the contrast set of 'vertical' components such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, etc." "Pragmatics should be defined, rather, as a perspective on whatever phonologists, morphologists, syntacticians, semanticists, psycholinguists, sociolinguists, etc. deal with" (1987: 36).

② There is an extensive survey of them in S. Levinson (1983: 5-35).

tempt at any rigorous definition is made in this book. Instead, I define it in very general terms as the study of language in use, as against the study of language as an abstract system. It does not take an elaborated examination to show that these two studies differ. The following sentence, for example, as a unit in the system is a question concerning the ownership of a pen.

(1) Is this your pen?

In actual situations, however, it may have several different meanings. When it is used in a post office by someone to a stranger beside, it may serve as a request, meaning (2). When it is used by a teacher to a student leaving the classroom after the class, it may function as a reminder, meaning (3). And when it is used by a mother to a child, especially if the pen is on the floor, it may be intended as a command as in (4).

(2) May I use it?

(3) Don't leave it behind.

(4) Pick it up!

As this aspect of meaning is outside of semantics proper, we may also agree with the formula: pragmatics = meaning - semantics.^①

1.2 The origin of pragmatics^②

The term "pragmatics" may be used in three senses. First, it may refer to a discipline, as is used in the beginning of this chapter. Secondly, owing to its token-reflexivity^③, the term may refer to itself. In this sense, we usually enclose it in quotation marks, as is done in the

① Cf. G. Gazdar (1979: x, 2).

② For a more detailed account, see 姜望琪 (1997).

③ This notion will be discussed at some length in section 2.2.2.

first sentence of this paragraph. Thirdly, "pragmatics" may refer to the phenomenon of language use, or that of the regularity in language use. For example, G. Leech (1983: 1) argues that "we cannot really understand the nature of language itself unless we understand pragmatics: how language is used in communication." The pragmatics as a discipline is the study of the pragmatics as a phenomenon. The latter, i.e. the phenomenon of language use, has been in existence ever since language came into being, or even earlier, in the very process of its coming into being. There can be no question about that. What requires some discussion is the pragmatics in the other two senses. The origin of the discipline pragmatics, both important and interesting, deserves a much more extended space than is possibly allowed here.^① In this chapter, therefore, we shall concentrate on the term "pragmatics".

1.2.1 The term "pragmatics"

The term "pragmatics" was first introduced into the literature by the American philosopher Charles William Morris in 1937, when he collected five of his papers written after 1934 and published them under the title of *Logical Positivism, Pragmatism and Scientific Empiricism*. In its preface, he asserted that "Analysis reveals that linguistic signs sustain three types of relations (to other signs of the language, to objects that are signified, to persons by whom they are used and understood) which define three dimensions of meaning. These dimensions in turn are objects of investigation by syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics, semiotic [now usually called 'semiotics'] being the general science which includes all of these and their interrelations"

^① For example, L. Horn (1988: 116) believes that "the study of pragmatics antedates the term by centuries if not millennia".

(p. 4).

In his *Foundations of the Theory of Signs* published in 1938, Morris expressed this idea again. That is, semiotics has three branches: syntactics, semantics and pragmatics. Syntactics studies “the formal relation of signs to one another”, semantics “the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable”, and pragmatics “the relation of signs to interpreters” (1971 [1938]: 21 – 2). In this book, he also made it known that “The term ‘pragmatics’ has obviously been coined with reference to the term ‘pragmatism’ The term ‘pragmatics’ helps to signalize the significance of the achievements of Peirce, James, Dewey, and Mead within the field of semiotic” (ibid. : 43).

1.2.2 Semiotics

Semiotics may be traced back to the ancient Greeks, but semiotics in the modern sense started with the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce. Peirce was hailed as the most versatile and original thinker America had ever produced. He graduated from Harvard in 1859, and went to the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in 1861, where he worked for thirty years. In this only official post he ever held, he did research into such diversified fields as astronomy, metrology, mathematics, thermodynamics, gravitation, optics, but he declared “it has never been in my power to study anything. . . except as a study of semiotic”.^① It is his conviction that all thought is in signs. In this sense, we can say Peirce studied only one discipline in his whole life, the theory of signs--semiotics.

Peirce gave the sign many definitions in his writings. Some are

① From M. Fisch (1978: 54).