LINGUISTICS|当代语言学研究文库|

浙江省社科规划课题成果
外国语言文学浙江省人文社科重点研究基地科研资助课题

赵　莉◎著

A Socio-cognitive Approach to Interpersonal Meaning of Code-switching

语码转换人际意义的社会认知研究

（英文版）

上海交通大学出版社
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

LINGUISTICS|当代语言学研究文库|

浙江省社科规划课题成果
外国语言文学浙江省人文社科重点研究基地科研资助课题

赵　莉◎著

A Socio-cognitive Approach to Interpersonal Meaning of Code-switching

语码转换人际意义的社会认知研究

（英文版）

上海交通大学出版社
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS
阜阳师范学院图书馆
藏书

内 容 提 要

本书运用构筑的分析模型，系统分析了语码转换人际意义的三种主要类型，即身份协商、关系调整和态势定位的动态建构过程。该书首次运用认知语言学的理论来探讨语码转换现象，为社会语言学的语言变异研究提供了新思路，同时，本书为认知语言学引入了“社会”的维度，丰富了认知语言学的理论内涵，也为认知语言学理论的运用开辟了新领域。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语码转换人际意义的社会认知研究：英文/赵莉著. —上海：上海交通大学出版社，2014

ISBN 978-7-313-11090-9

Ⅰ. ①语… Ⅱ. ①赵… Ⅲ. ①社会语言学-研究 Ⅳ. ①H0

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2014)第 075000 号

浙江省社科规划课题成果

“外国语言文学”浙江省人文社科重点研究基地科研课题资助项目

语码转换人际意义的社会认知研究(英文版)

著　　者：赵　莉

出版发行：上海交通大学出版社　　地　　址：上海市番禺路 951 号

邮政编码：200030　　电　　话：021-64071208

出 版 人：韩建民

印　　刷：凤凰数码印务有限公司　　经　　销：全国新华书店

开　　本：880mm×1230mm　1/32　　印　　张：9.625

字　　数：283 千字

版　　次：2014 年 6 月第 1 版　　印　　次：2014 年 6 月第 1 次印刷

书　　号：ISBN 978-7-313-11090-9/H

定　　价：38.00 元

版权所有　侵权必究

告 读 者：如发现本书有印装质量问题请与印刷厂质量科联系

联系电话：025-83657309

序

赵莉博士关于语码转换研究的专著就要出版了，请我写序，我感到非常高兴。愿与作者和读者一起分享她的成功和喜悦。赵莉硕士毕业于西南大学外国语学院，毕业后曾在天津一所高校任教。她2007年考入北京师范大学外文学院攻读博士学位，2011年毕业。她勤奋读书，善于思考与钻研，在同届同学中，是一位精力充沛、有自己见解，又很有研究实力的博士研究生。读博期间，就有文章在语言学核心刊物发表，展示出很强的学术研究能力和发展潜力。

赵莉研究的内容是语码转换。她的研究题目是“语码转换人际意义的社会认知研究”。语码转换(Code Switching)是指双语或多语使用者在交谈或写作中，交替使用两种或多种语言、方言或语体的现象。在不同语言接触的交际中非常普遍，受到社会语言学和跨文化交际研究的广泛关注，已经出版和发表大量研究成果。这些研究成果对语码转换的形式、使用、功能以及影响因素等方面进行了深入探讨。与已经出版的研究文献比，赵莉博士的这本研究专著有突出的特点和创新：

首先，她在研究内容和研究视角方面的创新，赵莉从社会语言学、功能语言学和认知语言学的理论出发，聚焦语码转换动态建构人际意义的认知研究。以往的语码转换研究文献较多地探究语码转换的结构特征、社会功能或影响和制约语码转换的社会因素。但是这些研究基本没有考察语码转换动态建构人际意义的过程，对于语码转换的结构特征与社会功能之间是如何联系的，其间是如何通过认知操作实现的，尚未进行比较深入的探讨。可以说，赵莉博士的论文采取“社会认知”的视角研究“语码转换”的人际意义，考察语码转换

中语言结构与社会功能之间认知的调停作用，揭示语码转换动态建构人际意义的认知过程，是本书的一个创新。是近年来认知语言学内部发生社会转向、认知社会语言学逐渐成为一门新兴的交叉学科背景下，借鉴认知语言学理论，拓宽社会语言学研究思路和领域的积极探索。

近几年来，我也读过几篇博士论文，这些论文尝试采用社会—认知的视角探究语言。研究视角新颖，很值得提倡。但多数论文在实际操作层面，很少有令人为之一新的融合。有的论文偏重分析社会因素，有的论文囿于解释认知过程，在基于两个语言学分支研究优势、提出独到见解，进行学术创新方面尚需进一步提高。从事社会与认知跨学科研究本身是有难度的，需要一种迎难而上、勇于探索和拼搏的精神，需要跨学科的知识和能力。赵莉博士的论文在这方面做了很好的探索，她的研究运用认知语言学的“图形—背景”理论来探讨社会语言学的语码转换现象，为社会语言学的语言变异研究提供了新的思路，同时她把“激活”、“注意”、“选择”这样一些认知操作置于社会语境中加以讨论，为认知语言学引入了“社会”的维度，丰富了认知语言学的理论内涵。为社会语言学与认知语言学的跨学科交叉研究提供了一个范例。

作者认为，语码并非储存人际意义的容器，而是激活与语码相联系的丰富的概念化表征的扳机，语言的意义是通过交际者在特定语境中动态地认知操作建构的。语码转换人际意义的建构也是发生在概念层上的一种认知操作。作者基于“社会建构主义”的理论和认知语言学的“百科全书意义观”，聚焦语码转换现象所涉及的语言、社会和认知因素，建立了一个分析语码转换动态建构人际意义的模型。我认为这是一个很有独到见解的创新。这里我不想赘述作者分析模式的具体细节，请读者阅读评判。赵莉博士分析模型的基本观点是：①语码转换建构人际意义的认知机制是“激活”、“注意”和“选择”这样一些人类普遍的认知操作；②语码转换的人际意义是通过语篇结构、认知操作和语境因素的互动建立起来的。

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

随着国际社会全球化的发展，跨文化跨语言的交流日益增多，人们在语言交际过程中，对不同语码的选择、转换、混合使用现象也会越来越多，并呈现出多元发展的趋势。对语码转换的语言结构及形式、使用及影响的探究已成为语言学研究中的重要任务之一。从认知视角研究语码转换人际意义的建构是一个很有意义的课题，但是从事这种研究既要研究人员具备扎实的认知语言学理论修养、熟练的语言技能、对语言交际敏锐的观察能力和严谨的研究方法，以及丰富的文史哲等方面的渊博知识，还需要研究者熟悉中英两种语言和文化的跨文化、跨语言的背景、意识和洞察力。赵莉博士已在这个领域取得了可喜的成绩。借她的学术专著出版之际，祝愿她以这本论若为出发点，逐步拓展，精益求精，继续探索社会语言学与认知语言学跨学科交叉研究的理论和实践，在语码转换研究领域做出新的成果和贡献。

田贵森

2013 年 11 月 8 日

Abbreviations and Transcription Conventions

AT = Appraisal Theory

CA = Conversation Analysis

CL = Cognitive Linguistics

CO = Cognitive Operation

CS = Code-switching

EC = Embedded Code

EL = Embedded Language

F = Figure

FGC = Figure-Ground Conversal

FGR = Figure-Ground Reversal

G = Ground

IMC= Interpersonal Meaning Construction

LM = Landmark

( ) = background information for a discourse

"" = direct quotations

[ ] = para-linguistic information

MC = Matrix Code

ML = Matrix Language

MLF = Matrix Language Frame model

MM = Markedness Model

LP = Linguistic Practice

MCS = Metaphorical Code-switching

RCM = the Rational Choice Model

RO = the rights-and-obligations set

SAT = Speech Accommodation Theory

SFL = Systemic Functional Linguistics

SCS = Situational Code-switching

SC = Social Context

TR = Trajector

... = omission of the part of the discourse

' ' = meaning of expressions or emphasis

Italics = linguistic expressions

Shadowed = the code-switched part of a discourse

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Definition of Code-switching 2
1.2 Research Topic, Questions and Aims 6
1.3 Research Rationale 8
1.3.1 Interpersonal Meaning Construction via CS 8
1.3.2 A Socio-cognitive Perspective 9
1.4 Scope and Structure of the Book 13

Chapter 2 Literature Review of Code-switching **17**
2.1 Sociolinguistic Studies on Code-switching 18
2.1.1 Gumperz's Tradition of CS Studies 19
2.1.2 Myers-Scotton's Seminal Work on CS 27
2.1.3 Conversation Analytic Approaches to Code-switching 37
2.2 Grammatical Treatment of Code-switching 43
2.2.1 Poplack et al's work on CS 43
2.2.2 MacSwan et al's Studies of CS 46
2.2.3 The Matrix Language Frame Model 47
2.3 Psycholinguistic Explorations of Code-switching 56
2.3.1 Giles' Speech Accommodation Theory 56
2.3.2 Grosjean's Guest Word Recognization Model 58
2.4 Summary 60

Chapter 3 A Socio-cognitive Framework of Code-switching …… 64
3.1 Theoretical Foundations for the Forthcoming Model …… 65
3.1.1 Vygotskian Social Constructionism …… 65
3.1.2 The "Encyclopaedic" View of Meaning …… 69
3.1.3 Bandura's Reciprocal Determinism …… 71
3.2 Theoretical Elements to be Integrated into the Model …… 74
3.2.1 The MC/EC Distinction …… 75
3.2.2 Profiling …… 79
3.2.3 Context …… 84
3.3 A Suggested Model of IMC via CS …… 89
3.3.1 Hypothesis of IMC via CS …… 90
3.3.2 Three Stages of IMC via CS …… 94
3.3.3 Three Principles in IMC of Code-switching …… 103
3.4 A Specific Illustration for the Model …… 113
3.5 A Classification of CS' Interpersonal Functions …… 117
3.6 Summary …… 120

Chapter 4 Stance Positioning via Code-switching …… 122
4.1 Introduction …… 122
4.2 Adopting Epistemic Stance via CS …… 126
4.2.1 Concealing Taboo topics via CS …… 127
4.2.2 Commitment Displaying via CS …… 138
4.2.3 Distancing via CS …… 141
4.2.4 Disaligning with the addressee via CS …… 153
4.3 Positioning Affective Stance via CS …… 155
4.3.1 Positive Stance Profiling via CS …… 156
4.3.2 Negative Stance Profiling via CS …… 162
4.4 Summary …… 175

Chapter 5 Relationship Scaling via Code-switching ····· **177**
5.1 Introduction ····· 177
5.2 Distance Scaling via CS ····· 182
5.2.1 Closeness-Profiling via CS ····· 183
5.2.2 Remoteness-Profiling via CS ····· 193
5.3 Status Scaling via CS ····· 203
5.3.1 Power Profiling via CS ····· 203
5.3.2 Solidarity Profiling via CS ····· 216
5.4 Summary ····· 224

Chapter 6 Identity Negotiating via Code-switching ····· **226**
6.1 Introduction ····· 226
6.2 Identity Profiling via CS ····· 230
6.2.1 Ethnic Identity Profiling via CS ····· 233
6.2.2 Political Identity Profiling via CS ····· 241
6.2.3 Occupational Identity Profiling via CS ····· 244
6.2.4 Relational Identity Profiling via CS ····· 247
6.3 Identity Fusing via CS ····· 250
6.3.1 Identity Integrating via CS ····· 251
6.3.2 Identity Mismatching via CS ····· 255
6.3.3 Identity Shifting via CS ····· 259
6.4 Summary ····· 265

Chapter 7 Conclusions ····· **267**
7.1 Major Points of the Present Research ····· 267
7.2 The Implications of the Present Research ····· 268
7.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research ····· 270

Bibliography ····· **272**
Index ····· **294**
Postscript ····· **295**

List of Figures and Tables

Figure 3.1 A triadic reciprocal constructionist view of CS ····· 73

Figure 3.2 Halliday's view of context ····· 86

Figure 3.3 An Integrated model of IMC via CS ····· 93

Figure 3.4 A classification of CS' functions ····· 120

Figure 4.1 The classificatory framework of "stance" ····· 125

Figure 5.1 Variation of relationship along the vertical and horizontal axes ····· 181

Figure 6.1 A schematic representation of "ethnic identity profiling" via CS ····· 238

Figure 6.2 A schematic representation of "identity mismatching" via CS ····· 259

Figure 6.3 A schematic representation of "identity shifting" via CS ····· 265

Table 6.1 Classification and illustrations of social identities ····· 233

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

Chapter 1
Introduction

Code-switching (also non-hyphenated as code-switching, hereafter CS), as one of the most intriguing and significant linguistic phenomena, has invited much scientific and scholarly analysis from the perspectives of sociolinguistics (e.g. Blom & Gumperz 1972; Gumperz 1982a; Myers-Scotton 1993a), structural linguistics (e.g. MacSwan 1999; Poplack 1980), psycholinguistics (e.g. Giles & Smith 1979; Tan 2000), conversation analysis (e.g. Auer 1999/2010; Gafaranga 2009; Li Wei 1994, 1998; Wang, Huang & Lü 2004), pragmatics (Liu 2000; Yu 2000, 2001, 2004), and systemic functional linguistics (e.g. Lü, Huang & Wang 2003; Wang 2005; Wang 2009; Zeng 2006), giving rise to a large body of achievements. However, despite the abundant literature, CS seems to remain more or less "invisible" for cognitive linguists, and for the past several decades, there have been few studies on CS within the Cognitive Linguistics (CL for short) paradigm. Moreover, in the field of sociolinguistics, CS researchers have focused on the relationship between code choices and social variables, yet few have made use of theories in CL as explanatory framework for CS analysis (see Kristiansen & Dirven 2008: 6);[①]

① Kristiansen and Dirven (2008) have noted that a number of issues which have traditionally been studied from a sociolinguistic perspective, such as style-shifting and code-shifting, are eminently well-situated for a cognitively-oriented type of analysis, yet few researchers have made such attempts except that Kristiansen (2008: 45-88) has done some ground-breaking work on style-shifting from a socio-cognitive perspective.

thus it inevitably results in the cognitive operation which triggers the social functions of CS inadequately explored. This leaves much room for the present study to approach the phenomenon of CS from a socio-cognitive perspective, with an aim to explore how CS can be "translated" into social meaning through cognitive processing.

1.1 Definition of Code-switching

The notion "code-switching" was originally taken from the field of communication technology, where it refers to a mechanism for the unambiguous transduction of signals between systems. In the 1950s and 1960s, psychologists in the early psycholinguistic studies of bilingualism assumed that the way bilinguals changed languages in verbal communication was similar to flicking an electric switch. Although nowadays ample evidence has proved that the alternative use of different linguistic varieties is far more complex than electric switching (Gardner-Chloros 2009), the name of CS has been remained as a very important term in linguistics, particularly for studies of language variation in sociolinguistics.

Yet, throughout its history, the term CS has acquired many controversies over its correlations with other contact phenomena as well as an unrivalled status in the field of language contact, as is shown by the fact that in the CS literature we may often come up against a terminological chaos such as code-switching, code-

mixing, diglossia,[①] and borrowing. In this book, we will draw on both Myers-Scotton's (1988) and conversation analysts' (e. g. Alvarez-Cáccamo 1998; Auer 1999/2010) discussion of CS, and give a provisional working definition of CS as follows:

> CS is the "one-off" "meaningful" juxtaposition of any two or more linguistic varieties (whether they are different languages, dialects, or styles) in the same stretching of discourse (either spoken or written). It is a major resource in the linguistic repertoire available for the bilingual interlocutors to construct interpersonal meaning.

This definition is characterized with the following aspects:

First, in this definition "code" in code-switching is used as a neutral umbrella term, and it is interchangeable with the usual catch-all term "variety" (see Myers-Scotton 1988),[②] covering languages, dialects, styles, registers, and any different sub-divisions of language. In fact, the notion "code" comes very close

---

①In the sociolinguistic literature on bilingualism, CS is both different from and dependent on diglossia. For diglossia, distinct varieties are employed in certain settings (such as home, school, work) that are associated with separate, special ceremonials, verbal games, etc., and such variety can be seen as having a distinct place or function within the local speech repertoire (see Gumperz 1982:61 for detail). Yet, for CS, although two varieties involved have a set of associated functions in a speech community, its specific meaning is dynamically on-line constructed through the interaction of its conventionalized implications and the immediate contextual factors.

②According to Myers-Scotton, CS is "the use of any two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation, whether they are different languages, styles, or dialects" (1988:201).

to that of "contextualisation cues" in Gumperz's (1982a) sense.[①] The scope of code-switching will be simultaneously narrowed to exclude socially or interactionally "meaningless" variety-alternation, and broadened in order to include phenomena of speech which recontextualize communication by signaling the onset of emerging frames via the shifting of codes other than languages.

Second, this definition introduces "one-off" as a dimension to draw a distinction between CS and "borrowing".[②] CS is a "one-off" language behavior in the sense that each occurrence of CS has its particular meaning, which has not been conventionalized within a speech community and cannot be copied by language users. According to Gumperz (1982a), borrowing is the introduction of single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one variety into the other. The borrowed items are incorporated into the grammatical system of the borrowing language. They are treated as an integral part of the lexicon, take on the morphological characteristics and enter into the syntactic

---

①"Contextualization" refers to all those activities performed by interactants "which make relevant/maintain/revise/cancel/ some aspects of context which, in turn, is responsible for the interpretation of an utterance in its particular locus of occurrence" (Auer 1995: 123). The aspects of context include larger-scale types of activities interactants are engaged in (speech genre) and smaller-scale types of activities (speech acts), as well as other aspects of communication such as the change of the topic, the type of information being conveyed (e.g. informative, evaluative, or metalinguistic talk), mode of interaction (formality or informality), the roles of the participants, and the social relationship between the participants, among others (see Auer 1984, 1995; Gumperz 1982). By drawing on Gumperz's theory of contextualization, or the notion of "contextualization cues", Auer (1995) proposes a theory of conversational code alternation, according to which, code alternation can be looked at as a type of contextualization cue, like any other contextualization cue.

②Poplack (1988) has postulated a separate category named "nonce borrowing" in order to cover cases where a single lexical item from one languge is integrated to the morphological rules of the other language. Yet, Poplack's proposal was questioned by Romaine who argues that "Poplack's defence to the structural integrity of linguistic systems is motivated less by the evidence than by the desire to justify the validity of a particular model of code-switching" (1995:286).

structures of the borrowing language. In a word, borrowed items can be repeatedly used by language users. CS, by contrast, relies on the meaningful juxtaposition of what speakers must "consciously or subconsciously process as strings formed according to the internal rules of *two distinct grammatical systems*" (Gumperz 1982a:66; emphasis original).

Third, "meaningful" is highlighted as an important criterion in distinguishing CS from code-mixing cases. In CS, the contrast between one code and the other is meaningful, and meaningless code-alternation may not be appropriate to be called "code-switching" at all (see Alvarez-Cáccamo 1998:29). CS is different from code-mixing in that the former stresses the dimension of sociolinguistic motivations while the latter is devoid of sociolinguistic considerations. Code-mixing is frequent and repeated cases of alternation between two codes. The hypothesis is that the more frequently CS occurs, the less salient it becomes; as a consequence, the potential for using it in locally meaningful ways is diminished, that is, frequent juxtaposition of two codes weakens the contextualization value of this cue.① Therefore, seen from the linguists' point of view, the occurrences of alternation in code-mixing do not carry meaning by way of code choices for the bilingual speakers (see Auer 1998:16).

①Code-switching and code-mixing actually lie on a continuum, which seems to represent one possible path of language development during the course of time. According to Gardner-Chloros (2009:35), the cline of CS and code-mixing may be an example of a cline from pragmatics to grammar, i. e. a case of grammaticalization. Code-mixing represents a kind of "fossilization" of CS both on the level of the individual and on that of the community, and there is a tendency to move from CS to CM, but not in the opposite direction.

1.2 Research Topic, Questions and Aims

In the field of sociolinguistics, Blom and Gumperz (1972) first distinguish two types of CS, i.e. situational CS (hereafter SCS) and metaphorical CS (hereafter MCS).[①] According to them, situational alternation of two varieties "redefines" a situation while metaphorical switching "enriches" a situation (Blom & Gumperz 1972:408—409; see Section 2.2.1 for detail). Following Blom and Gumperz, other sociolinguists such as Heller (1988) and Gardner-Chloros (2009) have also assumed the situational and metaphorical distinction of CS (cf. Myers-Scotton 1993).[②] Nowadays, it is almost universally agreed that metaphorical CS is so called because, just like a metaphorical expression, the appearance of a particular variety in situations where normally another variety is operative can simultaneously call into play all the meanings associated with the two varieties although there may be different degrees of salience. The very topic of the present study is metaphorical code-switching. Since Blom and Gumperz's first introduction of MCS into sociolinguistics, CS researchers within the sociolinguistics paradigm have paid great attention to the static description and classification of its functions (e.g. Clyne 1972; Jacobson 1978; McClure & McClure 1988; Romaine 1995), with the dynamic

① In this book, whenever CS is mentioned, it specifically refers to metaphorical CS, i.e. CS is used interchangeably with MCS for the sake of convenience. In contrast, situational CS will always be mentioned by SCS in order to make a distinction.

② For Myers-Scotton (1993), there is actually no such a sharp difference between MCS and SCS as assumed to be since both of the two types of CS are consequences of a diglossic distribution of the varieties, and the difference merely lies in that the situational type is a "direct" consequence of a diglossic distribution of the varieties while the metaphorical one derives its meaning from the separation more "indirectly".

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com