

学术语篇的转述和视角

——基于英语博士学位论文文献综述的研究

Reporting and Perspective in Academic Discourse

— A Study on Literature Reviews of English Dissertations

陈明芳 著

外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

学术语篇的转述和视角

——基于英语博士学位论文文献综述的研究

Reporting and Perspective in Academic Discourse

—— A Study on Literature Reviews of English Dissertations

陈明芳 著

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

学术语篇的转述和视角：基于英语博士学位论文文献综述的研究＝
Reporting and Perspective in Academic Discourse — A Study on Literature Reviews
of English Dissertations / 陈明芳著. — 北京：外语教学与研究出版社，2008.9
ISBN 978－7－5600－7811－3

I. 学… II. 陈… III. 英语—学位论文—写作—研究—英文
IV. H315

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字（2008）第143055号

出 版 人：于春迟

责任编辑：陈 静

封面设计：张 峰

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：北京华联印刷有限公司

开 本：650×980 1 / 16

印 张：20

版 次：2008年9月第1版 2008年9月第1次印刷

书 号：ISBN 978－7－5600－7811－3

定 价：46.90元

* * *

如有印刷、装订质量问题出版社负责调换

制售盗版必究 举报查实奖励

版权保护办公室举报电话：(010)88817519

物料号：178110001

序

陈明芳博士在其论文的基础上，即将出版《学术语篇的转述和视角——基于英语博士学位论文文献综述的研究》一书。听到这一消息，我感到由衷的高兴。陈明芳在完成博士学位的过程中，潜心钻研功能语言学，大量阅读有关转述和视角理论的书籍和论文，踊跃参加各种学术活动，而且还通过互联网与Hyland等国际知名学者探讨论文中所涉及的问题。她在攻读博士学位期间，凭着自己的毅力和勇气，发表了多篇学术论文，圆满完成了博士阶段的学习和研究任务，证明了自己的实力。

转述是一种常见的语言现象，因此得到了人们的长期研究，各种语言学理论从不同角度对它进行了探讨，但针对英语博士学位论文中文献回顾部分的转述展开研究并不多见，能从系统功能语言学和视角理论的角度探讨转述的功能意义的也为数不多。陈明芳博士的这部著作着力研究博士论文文献回顾部分中转述动词传递作者意义的机制，因此该书一方面提供了研究转述的新视角，一方面丰富了功能语言学的研究内容。

陈明芳博士在前辈学者对于转述现象的研究基础上，能够进行归纳总结，并指出以前研究的不足之处，确定自己的研究重点，说明各类转述动词的功能，以及转述动词与时态、语态的密切联系。为了更加详细地阐明各学科博士学位论文在转述和视角上的特征，她还建立了自己的语料库，分析归纳出文献综述语篇的语类结构，将所提出的分析框架应用到不同学科博士学位论文的研究中，说明转述动词在不同学科的使用和分布特征，得出了很有意义的结论。

可以说，该书所做的研究不仅具有理论意义，而且对学位论文的写作和英语语言教学有很强的指导意义，希望读者能从中受益。本人期待陈明芳博士能继续在功能语言学的研究方面出更多的成果。

杨信彰

2008年7月于厦门大学

前言

语言作为表述思想的中介，很少是客观的。作为一种特殊而又普遍的语言现象，转述也不例外。转述语的形式、表达方式、作者选用某个结构而放弃另一个结构都具有主观性，取决于说话者的交际意图、社会语境和立场观点。本书所指的转述是系统功能语法投射系统中的引述和报道。由于转述在语言交际中的普遍性，故自 19 世纪以来，中外学者就此问题做过广泛研究，他们或遵循 Leech 和 Short (1981) 模式对文学语篇中转述现象进行探讨，或以 Quirk 等 (1985) 理论为基础对转述现象进行语言语法分析。Halliday 则从语义角度解释语言转述现象，其投射理论框架自诞生之日起就被人们用于口语语篇、新闻语篇、广告语篇、文学语篇和学术语篇等多种语类的研究中，由于其在语篇分析中的广泛性，更由于其考虑到了一些非规范转述形式，使得其理论框架在语篇分析中比其他理论更具优势。

转述现象同样广泛存在于博士学位论文文献综述这一语类中，这是因为作者为了创建自己的研究空间，必须继续前期研究，所以常需大量转述他人观点，而转述动词的使用、转述结构、转述形式等等都反映作者看待现象经验的角度和态度，这也就是转述的视角问题。转述的视角是作者对词汇语法进行选择的结果，表达作者对所转述内容的介入。关于转述的视角问题，Halliday (1994) 指出“主从投射保留了投射句的直接性，即反映被投射句中说话者的视角；而在并列投射中，指示词有所改变，反映的是作者的视角”。至于在什么情况下选择主从投射和并列投射进行转述以及语篇中使用不同的转述结构与表达作者观点有无关系等问题，他留给了读者进行思考。

就目前的研究成果来看,还有许多问题值得探讨,比如:(1)英语学术语篇是如何通过巧妙地选择转述动词和其他转述结构来充分体现作者的身份及视角的;(2)以英语为母语者在转述时使用转述动词、其时态和语态、转述从句和元语篇等手段表达视角的真实面貌是什么;以及(3)研究结果对语言研究者,语言学习者和语言教学者进行文献综述的写作、评价和教学的启示。本书对诸如此类的问题作更为深入的探索,期待在学术语篇,尤其是博士学位论文文献综述这一语类中语言转述和视角研究方面有所发展。

本书研究英语学位论文文献综述中的语言转述现象,尤其是英语博士学位论文文献综述中的转述。通过对以英语为母语的作者所写的博士学位论文文献综述进行仔细考察,提出文献综述中语言转述分析的框架。在这一框架里,转述动词、其时态语态、转述从句以及元语篇都是体现视角的重要手段。故本书提出了视角化从句和视角化元语篇这两个概念,以此来表达视角和转述在文献综述中的自然结合。

视角可以通过对众多的暗示独特观点的转述动词的选择来体现。对这些动词做出选择常常暗示对视角的选择。文献综述中转述动词和它们的时态语态结合使用有助于作者实现其目的,即使其综述被学术团体所接受。视角也可以通过转述从句来体现。主要动词被认为支配紧随其后的视角化从句。从语义和句法的角度来看,本书的分析不仅承认主要动词语义的重要性,而且承认句子所处语境的特征。从认知的角度来看,视角化从句不同的句法结构被认为是对 *that* 从句所处的场景进行不同识解的反映。从功能的角度来看,它们是表达作者对被转述命题的评价、态度、意见、主观性以及观点的直接方式,比单个动词提供更多的选择和更多的讨论空间。本研究认为视角化元语篇是体现作者视角和表达作者态度的一种方式。它是传递表述和指称功能的特殊语篇,没有它读者不能解读上下文,作者无法使自己的作品得到认可。在文献综述的转述中,体现作者视角的元语篇是一种重要的功能特征:作者通过它不仅体现不同的视角,而且表达态度,增强如何表达自我和自己作品的意识。

本研究认为作者选择引证他人在某一研究领域已取得的成就、引用前人的观点、提出自己的研究进而表达自己的观点的方式来构建自己的

文献综述显然是由不同的社会背景和心理因素影响的结果。所以,自然科学和社会科学有着不同的学术规约和通过转述现象体现视角的方式。相应地,文献综述也在两个方面,即转述时语言手段的使用和通过转述表达视角的方式上表现出自然科学和社会科学的学科差异。基于这一观点,本书从功能和认知角度探讨博士学位论文文献综述中转述的独特性以及如何通过转述体现作者的视角,即作者对所转述的内容(言语和思想)的观点和评价,具有理论和实践意义。在理论上以系统功能语言学和认知语言学为理论框架,用定性分析和定量描写的分析方法对学术语篇进行分析和归纳,总结规律,深入探讨转述和体现转述视角的文献综述之间的语义关系,在此基础上建立一个科学的、合理的、操作性强的转述分析模式来考察转述对体现作者视角所起的作用,从而建立视角发生在语言各个层次的假设:从转述动词到转述从句、元语篇和语篇。实证研究主要围绕三个方面展开,即分析文献综述语篇体裁的结构特征、结构特征和视角的关系以及文献综述中由不同的转述手段所体现的视角。

以往的研究或注重学术语篇体裁的结构特征,或注重语篇中的语言特征,本书则一方面深入研究其结构特征,另一方面深入探讨转述在文献综述这一语篇体裁的多种功能,尤其是视角的体现。本研究聚焦于学术语篇中文献综述的转述和体现视角的多种语言结构和非语言知识(诸如规约知识、社会和心理因素)的语义关系,故本书是实现功能语言学和认知语言学互补、将视角理论运用到语篇分析的有益尝试。

陈明芳

2008年5月

List of abbreviations

Bio.	biology
CARS	Create a Research Space
Chem.	chemistry
CG	cognitive grammar
Comp.	computer science
DS	direct speech
DT	direct thought
E	empathy
Eco.	economy
EFL	English as a foreign language
Eng.	engineering
FDS	free direct speech
FDT	free direct thought
FIS	free indirect speech
FIT	free indirect thought
FTA	face threatening act
GSP	Generic Structure Potential
IS	indirect speech
LOB Corpus	The Lancaster Oslo/Bergen Corpus
Ling.	linguistics
LR	literature review
Mkt.	marketing
NRTA	narrative report of thought act
NRSA	narrative report of speech act
Phil.	philosophy
RA	research article

SFG	systemic functional grammar
SFL	systemic functional linguistics
Soc.	sociology
S&TP	speech and thought presentation
Phy.	physics
PQDD	ProQuest Digital Dissertation
PhD LRs	Literature Reviews of English dissertations by doctoral candidates
PoV	point of view

List of figures and tables

Figures

- Figure 2.1 Speech and thought presentation (Leech & Short 1981:344)
- Figure 2.2 Cline of 'interference' in report (Leech & Short 1981:324)
- Figure 3.1 The system of mood
- Figure 3.2 Metafunctions in the structure of a clause
- Figure 3.3 Realizations among strata (Butler 1985:59)
- Figure 3.4 The framework of lexicogrammatical forms to be analyzed
- Figure 4.1 Integral and non-integral citations in the ten disciplines (%)
- Figure 4.2 Integral and non-integral citations in humanities and sciences LRs (%)
- Figure 4.3 Number of LRs that use pronouns *I* and *we*
- Figure 5.1 Overall distributions of reporting verbs in the 100 LRs (after Hyland 2002:121)
- Figure 5.2 Instances of *report* and *find* in the 100 LRs
- Figure 5.3 Tenses of reporting verbs in sciences and humanities LRs: total number and percentage
- Figure 5.4 Tenses of reporting verbs in the 100 LRs
- Figure 5.5 Distribution of *say(s)* and *said*
- Figure 5.6 Number of passives of *say* with direct and indirect speech, and other complements
- Figure 6.1 Frequency of the first and third persons
- Figure 6.2 The transitivity analysis of interpersonal metaphor
- Figure 7.1 Various perspectival expressions in reporting in LRs

Tables

- Table 2.1 A brief classification of terminology

Table 2.2	Syntactic coding of semantic roles for reporting verbs (Dixon 1991:146)
Table 3.1	Types of processes, their participant roles and circumstances (after Halliday 1994:106-109)
Table 3.2	Participant roles and their fillers for figures of two types (Halliday & Matthiessen 1999:57)
Table 3.3	The framework of clause complex (after Halliday 1994:218-219)
Table 3.4	Basic types of clause complex in projection (Halliday 1994:220)
Table 4.1	Summary of dissertation types and their macro-structures (Paltridge 2002:135)
Table 4.2	Titles of the 100 PhD LR chapters/sections
Table 4.3	Swales's (1990:141) CARS model
Table 4.4	Hasan's (Halliday & Hasan 1985) GSP
Table 4.5	Actual structures and key elements in the 50 LRs
Table 4.6	Rank of citations by discipline
Table 4.7	Number of LRs that use pronouns <i>I</i> and <i>we</i>
Table 5.1a	Reporting verbs in the LRs of humanities
Table 5.1b	Reporting verbs in the LRs of sciences
Table 5.1c	Reporting verbs in the LRs of all the disciplines
Table 5.2	Categorization of reporting verbs in the studied data
Table 5.3a	Verbs denoting direct criticism in the humanities LRs
Table 5.3b	Verbs denoting direct criticism in the science LRs
Table 5.3c	Verbs denoting direct criticism in the 100 LRs
Table 5.4	Instances of <i>report</i> and <i>find</i> in the 100 LRs
Table 5.5a	Tenses of reporting verbs in the humanities LRs: total number and percentage
Table 5.5b	Tenses of reporting verbs in the science LRs: total number and percentage
Table 5.5c	Tenses of reporting verbs in the 100 LRs
Table 5.6a	Distribution of passive voice in the humanities LRs
Table 5.6b	Distribution of passive voice in the science LRs
Table 5.6c	Distribution of passive voice in the 100 LRs

Table 5.7	Distribution of <i>say(s)</i> and <i>said</i>
Table 5.8	Number of passives of <i>say</i> with direct and indirect speech, and other complements
Table 6.1	Classification of perspectival <i>that</i> -clause (after Quirk et al. 1985:1114, 1391)
Table 6.2	Distribution of the four types of perspectival <i>that</i> -clause
Table 6.3a	Frequency of perspectival <i>that</i> -clauses in the humanities LRs
Table 6.3b	Frequency of perspectival <i>that</i> -clauses in the science LRs
Table 6.3c	Frequency of perspectival <i>that</i> -clauses in the 100 LRs
Table 6.4	Classification of clause-complex containing perspectival <i>that</i> -clauses
Table 6.5	Distribution of perspectival <i>that</i> -clauses in the elements of LRs
Table 6.6	Categories and functions of metadiscourse (after Hyland 1998)
Table 6.7	Frequency of the first and third persons
Table 6.8	Verbs most often used with the first person markers in the 100 LRs
Table 6.9a	Frequency of person markers <i>I/we</i> in reporting in the humanities LRs
Table 6.9b	Frequency of person markers <i>I/we</i> in reporting in the sciences LRs
Table 6.9c	Frequency of person markers <i>I/we</i> in reporting in the 100 LRs
Table 6.10	Frequency of <i>argue(s)</i> and <i>argued</i> in the LRs of all the disciplines
Table 6.11	Frequency of perspectival metadiscourse <i>as ...</i> (per 100 reporting verbs)
Table 7.1	A model for PhD LRs

Contents

List of abbreviations.....	xi
List of figures and tables	xiii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background to the study.....	1
1.2 The research objectives and significance.....	8
1.3 Methodology and data collection.....	11
1.4 Organization of this book	15
Chapter 2 The previous studies of reporting.....	18
2.1 Introduction.....	18
2.2 Defining reporting.....	18
2.3 Approaches to reporting.....	20
2.3.1 The philosophical approach	20
2.3.2 The stylistic approach.....	23
2.3.3 The general linguistic approach	28
2.3.3.1 The lexical approach	29
2.3.3.2 The syntactic and semantic approach	31
2.3.4 The pragmatic approach	36
2.3.5 The systemic-functional approach	40
2.3.6 Other researches concerning reporting.....	45
2.4 Advantages and drawbacks of the previous studies on reporting.....	47
2.5 The interrelation between reporting and perspective.....	50
2.5.1 Studies in perspective.....	50
2.5.2 Aspects of natural joint.....	53
2.6 Summary	55

Chapter 3 Theoretical considerations	57
3.1 Introduction	57
3.2 Systemic-functional grammar	58
3.2.1 Three metafunctions	58
3.2.2 Clause complex	63
3.2.3 Realization	64
3.2.4 Genre	66
3.3 Cognitive grammar	69
3.3.1 Perspective	69
3.3.2 Attention, vantage point, empathy, starting point and point of view	70
3.3.3 Brief comments on these notions	73
3.4 Motivations for the study of LRs in English dissertations	74
3.5 Language levels to be analyzed	76
3.5.1 Reporting verbs	77
3.5.2 Metadiscourse	81
3.5.3 Tense	82
3.5.4 Voice	85
3.5.5 <i>That</i> -clause and <i>it</i> -clause	86
3.6 Summary	89
Chapter 4 Generic structure potential of Literature Reviews	91
4.1 Introduction	91
4.2 Purposes and significance of LRs	92
4.2.1 Titles	92
4.2.2 Focuses and goals	94
4.3 Generic structure of LRs	98
4.4 Elements of LRs and relations between elements and perspectives ...	102
4.4.1 Element analysis	103
4.4.2 Citation: an important feature in Elements 2 and 3	109
4.4.3 Relations between elements and perspectives	115
4.5 Summary	123

Chapter 5 Reporting verbs in Literature Reviews	125
5.1 Introduction.....	125
5.2 Pervasiveness of reporting verbs in LRs.....	126
5.3 Categories of reporting verbs.....	130
5.4 Functional analysis of reporting verbs in LRs	138
5.4.1 Functions of research verbs in reporting.....	139
5.4.2 Functions of cognition verbs in reporting.....	145
5.4.3 Functions of discourse verbs in reporting.....	146
5.5 Disciplinary variations in reporting verbs	151
5.5.1 Disciplinary preferences for perspective portraying.....	151
5.5.2 A case study: <i>report</i> and <i>find</i>	156
5.6 Tense of reporting verbs in LRs.....	160
5.6.1 Distributions of tenses of reporting verbs in the 100 LRs.....	160
5.6.2 Tense realizations in LRs.....	165
5.7 Voice of reporting verbs in LRs	170
5.7.1 Functions of the passives of reporting verbs in LRs.....	172
5.7.2 Disciplinary variation of the passives of reporting verbs	177
5.7.3 A case study: the verb <i>say</i>	184
5.8 Summary	189
 Chapter 6 Perspectival <i>that</i>-clause and metadiscourse in Literature Reviews.....	 191
6.1 Introduction	191
6.2 Classification and significance of perspectival <i>that</i> -clause	192
6.2.1 Experiential function	195
6.2.2 Interpersonal function	198
6.2.3 Textual function.....	204
6.3 Distributions of perspectival <i>that</i> -clauses.....	207
6.4 Perspectival <i>that</i> -clauses in LRs	210
6.4.1 The entity commented on.....	212
6.4.2 Stance of the writer towards the entity commented on	215
6.4.3 Source of the comments.....	217
6.4.4 The perspectival expression.....	219

6.5	Perspectival metadiscourse in LRs.....	221
6.6	Functional analyses of person markers <i>I</i> and <i>we</i>	224
6.6.1	Person markers as a rhetorical means.....	224
6.6.2	Functional realizations of person markers <i>I</i> and <i>we</i>	229
6.6.3	A case study: the use of <i>argue</i>	238
6.7	Functional analyses of attitude markers <i>I find</i> , <i>I believe</i> , <i>I think</i> and <i>I know</i>	240
6.7.1	A way of foregrounding	241
6.7.2	A politeness interpretation	241
6.7.3	A discourse strategy	243
6.7.4	A way of projection and modality	245
6.7.5	A device of evaluation	250
6.8	About <i>as</i>	251
6.9	Summary	254
Chapter 7	Conclusion	256
7.1	Introduction	256
7.2	Findings of the current study.....	256
7.3	Significance of the current study	264
7.4	Limitations and suggestions for further research	265
Appendix 1	Data sources	267
Appendix 2	Data samples	270
Bibliography		276
后记		301