

意识流语篇

回指释义认知语用研究

赵卫 著

*Yishiliu Yupian
Huizhi Shiyi Renzhi Yuyong Yanjiu*

山东大学出版社

意识流语篇回指释义认知语用研究

A Cognio-pragmatic Approach to Anaphora
Resolution in Stream-of-consciousness Discourse

赵 卫 著



山东大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

意识流语篇回指释义认知语用研究/赵卫著.

—济南:山东大学出版社,2013.8

ISBN 978-7-5607-4862-7

I. ①意… II. ①赵… III. ①英语—语用学—研究
IV. ①H31

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2013)第 205965 号

责任策划:陈 珊

责任编辑:王 潇

封面设计:张 荔

出版发行:山东大学出版社

社 址 山东省济南市山大南路 20 号

邮 编 250100

电 话 市场部(0531)88364466

经 销:山东省新华书店

印 刷:济南景升印业有限公司印刷

规 格:880 毫米×1230 毫米 1/32

7.25 印张 170 千字

版 次:2013 年 8 月第 1 版

印 次:2013 年 8 月第 1 次印刷

定 价:15.00 元

版权所有,盗印必究

凡购本书,如有缺页、倒页、脱页,由本社营销部负责调换

前 言

语篇回指的释义(discourse anaphora resolution)研究一直是语篇分析、认知语言学、心理语言学、自然语言处理等领域热点而又棘手的话题。近二三十年来,国外学者从不同理论视角探究回指释义的动因机制和运作模式,形成许多颇具影响力的回指释义理论和模式,如约束理论(Chomsky, 1982)、话题连续模式(Givón, 1983, 1985, 1990)、语篇功能模式(Halliday, 1976, 1981, 1985, 1999)、语篇层级模式(Fox, 1987)、修正的新格赖斯语用回指理论(Huang, 2000)、可及性模式(Ariel, 1990)、认知参照点模型(van Hoek, 1992)和向心回指模型(Grosz, Joshi & Weinstein, 1995)等。国内回指研究也成果丰硕,重点关注汉语自然语篇中的回指释义问题,对原有回指释义理论作出修正或模式重构,形成汉语回指语释义理论和模式,如框—椂和线性结构回指模式(廖秋忠, 1985)、宏观与微观连续模式(陈平, 1987)、可及性与主题化模式(许余龙, 2003, 2004)、回指优选释义模式(熊学亮, 2005)、联想名词回指模式(徐赓赓, 2005)、间接回指认知释义模型(王军, 2003,

2004)和向心回指模型(许宁云,2006;王德亮,2004,2006;许余龙,2008)等。国内回指研究学者基于汉语语料,对既有回指理论的修正及理论模式创新架构,为进一步研究回指现象指出了未来发展路径。通过对上述回指理论的梳理归纳,我们应注意到三点:

一、综观回指研究历史,其研究发展历程主要有三大转向。一是研究范围的延展,从句内回指研究延展至语篇回指研究。二是回指功能定位的丰富,从替代实体到衔接手段再转为心理实体。三是释义模型构建视角的转向,从静态语义观转变为动态语义观。三大转向标志着当前回指研究的发展趋势。

二、语篇回指释义是一个极其复杂的语言现象,要对其充分解释需要结构、语用和认知诸因素协同运作。Huang(2000, pp. 173—174)认为在对语篇回指作出预测的三个交互作用的因素中,结构制约(线性和层级)相对于更为重要的认知和语用制约而言,是居第二位的。然而,认知和语用因素如何交互作用及其作用大小配置还不甚明晰,还需对其深入、透彻的研究。

三、回指释义模式因语言类型、领域和语类而异。语篇回指特点和分布规律因语言类型、领域和语类而异。因此,语料对构建多样态的语篇回指模式至关重要。上述诸多研究所选语料主要以一般叙事语篇、会话语篇等自然语篇为主。而以复杂虚拟叙事意识流语篇为语料的回指研究却鲜有所见。少数学者在此方面作了有益探讨,如张莲(2004)、王义娜(2007)、赵秀凤(2008),其研究基于第三人称意识流小说语料,从认知参照点或定景角度出发,以人物视角转换为切入点,探究意识流语篇中指称语特点、分布规律、功能动因和认知操作规律。所构建的理论模式是否适用于其他语篇

类型,还有待检验。

总之,国内外回指研究已取得丰富成果,为本研究的后续展开奠定了坚实基础。但现有回指研究(1)主要以一般自然语篇为语料,很少有基于意识流语料库的语篇回指研究;(2)很少对认知和语用因素在制约回指释义中的交互关联方式及作用大小配置展开深入研究。基此,本研究拟以最佳关联原则为导向的回指转喻推理过程为理论框架,从认知语用视角对影响意识流语篇回指释义的各制约因素及其交互关联方式和作用大小配置展开深入探讨,以揭示意识流语篇回指现象背后的认知语用动因,进而提出意识流语篇中回指转喻释义模式和原则假设,然后运用意识流语料验证该回指模式的预测力、解释力以及是否具有普适性,从而为回指释义研究开辟另类视角。本研究理论框架构建的基本思路为:

首先,根据关联理论的最佳关联原则,语篇的连贯解读需要读者付出相应的认知努力,其认知努力的大小与其获得的语境效果成正比。语篇回指作为语篇衔接与连贯的纽带,其解码也同样受到最佳关联原则的制约。

其次,根据符号学理论和篇章转喻理论,所有回指现象都是转喻性的。转喻存在规约化梯度,从而使我们将转喻触发词(先行词)与目标词(回指词)的连接视为一个渐进的连续体。

再次,回指编码受两个因素的制约:(1)先行词(转喻触发词)和回指词(转喻目标词)的认知距离。(2)认知努力和语境效果之间的正相关关系,即读者获得作者意图的语境效果所作的认知语用推理的步骤。(1)与(2)之和可以成为制约篇章回指编码的参数。

最后,本理论框架由两部分构成:一是以关联为导向的篇章回指转喻释义模型;二是以关联为导向的篇章回指转喻释义原则。前者重在对分析过程的理论抽象概括,后者重在验证模型的解释力和预测力。因此,原则是对模型的具体应用。

本研究基于以最佳关联原则为导向的回指转喻推理过程,构建意识流语篇中以关联为导向的语篇回指转喻释义模式和原则,并运用意识流语料验证其解释力。研究表明:(1)理想化认知模型是回指释义的认知心理基础。(2)认知和语用因素对回指释义的制约交互关联,其作用大小配置可根据先行词和回指词的最佳关联度和概念距离的赋值之和得以测量。(3)本研究理论假设因其认知和语用理论取向,其本质更接近于一个倾向性理论框架。(4)本理论框架由两部分构成:一是以关联为导向的语篇回指转喻释义模式;二是以关联为导向的语篇回指转喻释义原则。前者重在对分析过程的理论抽象概括,后者重在验证模式的解释力和预测力。该理论框架不仅对意识流语篇,而且对其他语篇类型的回指释义也有一定的解释力。简言之,以关联为导向的语篇回指转喻释义实为发生在理想化认知模型中,听话人或读者基于先行词和回指词的概念距离寻求二者达到最佳关联的认知语用推理过程。

赵 卫

2013年5月

Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background of the Present Study	1
1.2	Basic Notions and Terminology	3
1.3	The Aims of the Research	7
1.4	Research Questions	7
1.5	Methodology	8
1.6	Significance of the Present Study	11
1.7	Outline of the Study	12
Chapter 2	Theories of Discourse Anaphora	13
2.1	Introduction	13
2.2	Theories of Discourse Anaphora; An Overview	14
2.3	Conclusion	33

Chapter 3 A Metonymic Account of Anaphora in Stream-of-consciousness Discourse	36
3.1 Theoretical underpinnings	37
3.2 Rationales of the Proposed Theoretical Framework	48
3.3 A Metonymic Model of Anaphora Resolution	60
3.4 The Metonymic Principles of Anaphora Resolution	63
3.5 The Relation between the Model and Principles within the Proposed Framework	64
Chapter 4 The Metonymic Principles of Anaphora Resolution in Stream-of-consciousness Discourse	65
4.1 Introduction	65
4.2 Applications of the Principles to Anaphora Resolution in Stream-of-consciousness Discourse	66
4.3 Associative Anaphora for Metonymic Relation of “Concept for Thing”	97
4.4 Anaphora for Metonymic Relation of “Concept for Concept”	104
4.5 Zero Pronoun Anaphora for Metonymic Relation of “Thing for Form”	108
4.6 Zero Pronoun Anaphora for Metonymic Relation of “Concept for Form”	113
Chapter 5 Discussions and Conclusions	116
5.1 Discussions	116

5.2 Conclusions	119
附 录	121
References	185

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Background of the Present Study

Anaphora has been for long one of the most fascinating phenomena both in philosophical and linguistic academia since it constitutes a unique and universal property of human mind and language. Every single natural language has a rich variety of linguistic means which can help speakers to refer to entities in the world. The multidimension and complexity of anaphora will provide us a window through which the nature of working machinery of human mind and language can be viewed. This also explains the multidisciplinary nature of anaphora research,

because no discipline may be complete without covering anaphora. It has aroused great interests from philosophers, psychologists, cognitive scientists and artificial intelligence workers, etc.

“Anaphora”^① may be defined broadly as reference to something mentioned or implied in previous discourse (Green, 1989). Lust (1986, p. 23) defines anaphora more explicitly as the relation between a proform, called an anaphor, and another expression, called an antecedent. By pairing the anaphor with its antecedent, the former repeats the reference or the sense that the latter has already established.

Chomsky (1981, 1995) examines extensively the phenomenon of anaphora and he considers the part of grammar that deals with anaphoric relations (Binding Theory) to be in the core of Universal Grammar. Chomsky believes that a thorough examination of anaphora can be a useful tool for the understanding of the nature of the language faculty. Furthermore, the phenomenon of anaphora expands in syntax, semantics, pragmatics and cognition. Huang (2000) holds the similar view

^① Huang (2000) suggests that from a cognitive perspective, anaphora can also be defined as a relation between a linguistic expression and the mental entities the linguistic expression evokes in the listener's/reader's mind.

that anaphora “provided a testing ground for a number of competing hypotheses concerning the relationship between syntax, semantics, and pragmatics in linguistic theory” (p. 2). Therefore, the study of anaphora can throw fresh light on how these components interact with each other. In a nutshell, the study of anaphora is considered to be an effective way of furthering our understanding of the nature of human language as well as of the human mind/brain.

1.2 Basic Notions and Terminology

1.2.1 The Definition of Anaphora

In modern linguistics, anaphora is commonly used to refer to a relation between two linguistic elements, wherein the interpretation of one (called an anaphor) is in some way determined by the interpretation of the other (called an antecedent) (e. g. Huang, 1994, p. 1; Lust, 1986; Wasow, 1986).

Broadly construed, the term “anaphora” is used to cover myriad disparate cases of a linguistic expression receiving part, or

all, of its semantic interpretation via a dependency upon an antecedent, rather than from its internal lexical content.

1. 2. 2 Classifications of Anaphora

1. 2. 2. 1 Hankamer and Sag's Classification

According to Hankamer and Sag (1976), anaphora falls into two basic types. Surface anaphors are syntactically controlled, in that they require a linguistic antecedent of a particular syntactic form. Examples of surface anaphora include gapping, verb phrase ellipsis(VPE), and so on. Deep anaphors, on the other hand, do not require an antecedent of a particular syntactic form, but only a referent that is of the appropriate semantic type. Deep anaphoric reference may be pragmatically controlled, whereby the referent is evoked situationally without any linguistic introduction.

Crucially for Hankamer and Sag, whether an anaphor is deep or surface is independent of whether it has an overt phonological realization or not. For the most part, later research has backed up this claim. *Do it* anaphora (Kehler & Ward, 2004) and Null Complement Anaphora (Depiante, 2000) are instances of overt deep and nonovert deep anaphora respectively, while VPE and Sluicing are nonovert surface anaphors (Goldberg, 2005;

Merchant, 2001). The exception is the overt surface category. Hankamer and Sag's only example is anaphoric *so*, e. g. Adrian played chess and Roxanne did so too.

To sum up, surface anaphora requires an antecedent of an appropriate syntactic form, which in turn implies that its referent must be linguistically evoked. In contrast, deep anaphora only requires a semantic referent of the appropriate type and allows for such referents to be situationally evoked.

1.2.2.2 Ariel's Classification

Ariel (1990, p. 58) holds that deep anaphora, whose retrieved referent is required to be semantically coherent, is pragmatically controlled. She further points out that deep anaphora can be used not only in physical context but also in linguistic context, and the antecedent can be a linguistic unit of discourse.

Deep anaphora can be formally divided into three types: anaphora without explicit linguistic antecedent, zero pronoun, ambiguous anaphora.

(1) Anaphora without explicit linguistic antecedent/antecedentless anaphora

Anaphora without explicit linguistic antecedent means the reference of anaphor is beyond the discourse.

(2) Zero pronoun (zero pronominal anaphora)

Zero pronominal anaphora occurs when the anaphoric pronoun is omitted but is nevertheless understood.

Why use zero pronoun? Because the referent of zero pronoun anaphor is the topic of a communicative event, which has become the salient entity in the mental representation of addresser and addressee before zero pronoun anaphor occurs. The interpretation of the referent may resort to the activation of cognitive context.

(3) Ambiguous anaphora

Ambiguous anaphora refers to anaphor in the linguistic context having two or more possible antecedents. The ambiguity in the resolution can not be excluded by syntactic relations. Hence a dynamic cognitive context is required.

Under Transformational-generative (TG) grammar, surface anaphora reference tracking can be resolved by indexing at the surface structure, and pragmatic inferencing is not involved in the tracking process. Two conditions are supposed to be satisfied to realize surface co-reference: (a) Anaphor must have explicit linguistic antecedent; (b) Anaphor is expected to agree with antecedent in terms of person, gender and number.

However, as to the three types of anaphora mentioned above, the two conditions can not be simultaneously satisfied and are not automatically resolved. Therefore we should take cognitive and pragmatic dimensions into account in the study to

handle the resolution of deep anaphora.

1.3 The Aims of the Research

The research is intended to build a metonymic model of anaphora resolution and derive some principles to account for discourse anaphora in stream-of-consciousness discourse.

Based on observation and intuition on the characteristics of anaphora in stream-of-consciousness discourse, a hypothesis is made about the building of a metonymic model and principles of anaphora resolution to cover peculiar and unusual anaphoric distribution in SOC discourse.

A corpus comprised of both Chinese and English stream-of-consciousness novels is used to first explore the basic distributional patterns of surface and deep anaphora and second testify the adequacy and validity of the proposed model and principles. Then some constraints on anaphora resolution are pinned down. Last, some revisions on them will be made to get a comparatively viable and reasonable account of anaphora resolution in stream-of-consciousness discourse.

1.4 Research Questions

Two questions will be probed into in the present study.