

<<英语缓冲语的语用发展>>

图书基本信息

书名：<<英语缓冲语的语用发展>>

13位ISBN编号：9787030338471

10位ISBN编号：7030338472

出版时间：2012-4

出版时间：科学出版社

作者：余盛明

页数：358

版权说明：本站所提供下载的PDF图书仅提供预览和简介，请支持正版图书。

更多资源请访问：<http://www.tushu007.com>

## <<英语缓冲语的语用发展>>

### 内容概要

《英语缓冲语的语用发展》以发展语用学（Developmental Pragmatics）为基本理论框架，对英语缓冲语（hedging）的语用发展做了较为全面细致的论述与研究。

国际上，发展语用学的研究基本上都是以言语行为（speechacts）和语篇能力（discourseability）为研究对象，而《英语缓冲语的语用发展》则深入到缓冲语的语用能力（即对言语行为和语篇的修饰能力）发展研究，为发展语用学和语际语用学（Interlanguage Pragmatics）拓宽了研究领域。

## &lt;&lt;英语缓冲语的语用发展&gt;&gt;

## 书籍目录

Contents Acknowledgements 前言 Abstract Chapter 1 Introduction 1.1 Interlanguage Pragmatic Development 1.2 Hedging in ILP Development 1.3 Plan of the Book Chapter 2 Interlanguage Pragmatic Development: Review and Methodology 2.1 Reviewing L2 Pragmatic Development 2.1.1 Development of L2 Discourse Ability 2.1.2 Development of L2 Speech-Act Ability 2.2 Methodological Issues with ILP Developmental Studies 2.2.1 Corpus Approach to ILP Development 2.2.2 Emergence Pattern as Indicator of Development 2.3 Chapter Summary Chapter 3 An Overview of Hedging Studies in the Literature 3.1 Development of the Concept of Hedging 3.2 Studies of Hedges in Academic Writing 3.3 Studies of Hedges in Spoken Discourse 3.4 Studies on Hedge Comprehension 3.5 Studies on L2 Learners' Hedges 3.6 Taxonomy of Hedges in the Literature Chapter 4 Theoretical Framework for the Study 4.1 Grammatical, Pragmatic and Semantic Properties of Hedges 4.2 Establishing Hedging Categories for the Study 4.2.1 Modal Hedges 4.2.2 Mental Hedges and Performative Hedges 4.2.3 Pragmatic-Marker Hedges 4.2.4 Quantificational Hedges 4.2.5 Section Summary 4.3 Criteria and Guidelines for Hedge Identification Chapter 5 Research Design and Data Collection 5.1 Research Questions 5.2 Participants in the Study 5.3 Instruments for Data Collection 5.3.1 Rationale for Instrument Making 5.3.2 Instrument Design and Piloting 5.4 Data Collection Chapter 6 Data Analyses 6.1 Data Coding 6.2 Hedge Categories Emerging from the Data 6.3 Hedge Identification and Related Problems 6.3.1 Analyzing Modal Shields 6.3.2 Analyzing Quantificational Approximators and NI Approximators 6.3.3 Analyzing Performative Shields 6.3.4 Analyzing Pragmatic-Marker Hedges Chapter 7 Results 7.1 Development in Quantificational Approximators 7.1.1 Quantificational Approximators at JH Level 7.1.2 Quantificational Approximators at SH Level 7.1.3 Quantificational Approximators at UN Level 7.1.4 Comparing Quantificational Approximators across Three Levels 7.2 Development in "Negation+Intensifier" Approximators 7.2.1 NI Approximators at JH Level 7.2.2 NI Approximators at SH Level 7.2.3 NI Approximators at UN Level 7.2.4 Comparing NI Approximators across Three Levels 7.3 Development in Performative Shields 7.3.1 Performative Shields at JH Level 7.3.2 Performative Shields at SH Level 7.3.3 Performative Shields at UN Level 7.3.4 Comparing Performative Shields across Three Levels 7.4 Development in Modal Shields 7.4.1 Modal Shields at JH Level 7.4.2 Modal Shields at SH Level 7.4.3 Modal Shields at UN Level 7.4.4 Comparing Modal Shields across Three Levels 7.5 Development in Pragmatic-Marker Hedges 7.5.1 PM Hedges at JH Level 7.5.2 PM Hedges at SH Level 7.5.3 PM Hedges at UN Level 7.5.4 Comparing PM Hedges across Three Levels 7.6 Summarizing Major Hedge Categories 7.6.1 Summarizing Types, Tokens, and Rates 7.6.2 Type-Token Ratios and Most Frequent Hedges 7.6.3 Summarizing Differences between Data Genres 7.7 Hedge Combinations and Hedging Effect Chapter 8 Discussion 8.1 Results of This Study Compared to Findings of Previous Studies 8.2 Methodological Effects 8.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies Chapter 9 Conclusion References Appendix 1 Written Questionnaire Appendix 2 Plan for Oral Interview Appendix 3 Data Samples: Written Data Appendix 4 Data Samples: Interview Data Appendix 5 Data Samples: Debate Data List of Tables 2-1 Proposed developmental sequence in alignment expressions for JEL learners 2-2 Five stages of L2 request development 3-1 Test results for the meaning of about and around 3-2 Hedging functions and principal realization devices 3-3 Ransom's option chart 4-1 Grammatical categories of hedging 4-2 Inventory of pragmatic markers received scholarly attention 4-3 Comparing three hedging strategies 5-1 Participants in the study 5-2 Descriptive statistics for the "total score" of PETS test 5-3 One-way ANOVA for the "total score" of PETS test 5-4 The most frequently suggested controversial topics 5-5 Data and hedge counts in the pilot studies 5-6 Written data used for analysis 5-7 Interview data 5-8 Debate data 5-9 Summary of three genres of data 6-1 Categories and semantic components established for modal auxiliaries 6-2 Relationship between modality and hedging 7-1 Quantificational approximators by JH students 7-2 Quantificational approximators by SH students 7-3a Quantificational approximators by UN students: quantity 7-3b Quantificational approximators by UN students: frequency 7-3c Quantificational approximators by UN students: degree 7-3d Quantificational approximators by UN students: summary 7-4a Comparing quantificational approximators across three levels (a) 7-4b Comparing quantificational approximators across three levels (b) 7-5 NI approximators by JH students 7-6 NI approximators by

<<英语缓冲语的语用发展>>

SH students7-7 NI approximators by UN students7-8 Comparing NI approximators across three proficiency levels7-9 Performative shields by JH students7-10 Performative shields by SH students7-11 Performative shields by UN students7-12 Comparing performative shields across the three levels7-13 Modal shields by JH students7-14 Modal shields by SH students7-15a Modal shields by UN students:modal auxiliaries7-15b Modal shields by UN students:modal adv.,adj.& n.7-15c Modal shields by UN students:summary7-16 Comparing modal shields across three proficiency levels7-17 PM hedges by JH students7-18 PM hedges by SH students7-19a PM hedges by UN students:interpersonal7-19b PM hedges by UN students:propositional7-19b PM hedges by UN students:propositional(continued)7-19c PM hedges by UN students:summary7-20 Comparing PM hedges across three proficiency levels7-21 Summary of hedges in five major categories7-22 Summary of hedge types7-23 Summary of hedge tokens7-24 Type-Token ratios7-25 Most frequent hedges for the three levels7-26 Comparing written,interview and debate genres at JH level7-27 Comparing written,interview and debate genres at SH level7-28 Comparing written,interview and debate genres at UN levelList of Figures3-1 Categorization of scientific hedges7-1 Comparing""I think""and other performative shields across levels7-2 Comparing rates of performative shields across three levels7-3 Top five modal shields by JH students7-4 Top five modal shields by SH students7-5 Top five modal shields by UN students7-6 Comparing hedge types across three proficiency levels7-7 Comparing rates of hedge types across three proficiency levels7-8 Comparing hedge tokens across three proficiency levels7-9 Comparing rates of hedge tokens across three proficiency levels7-10 Comparing written,interview and debate genres at JH level7-11 Comparing written,interview and debate genres at SH level7-12 Comparing written,interview and debate genres at UN level

## 章节摘录

However, according to Nuyts, the situation is different with modal adjectives: they do systematically involve an additional evidential meaning. Nuyts (2001, p. 66) observes that "This evidential meaning is probably not due to the adjective as such, but rather to the syntax which it brings along." The standard syntactic form of modal adjectives is the "it is probable that" type, and its evidentiality "is obviously due to the impersonal nature of this construction, as well as to the suggestion inherent in the use of the copula that the modal qualification is a property of the stage of affairs proper" (p. 66). But Nuyts also warns (2001, p. 68) that expressions with modal adjectives do not always indicate evidentiality, particularly when they are in different variations of the standard syntactic pattern. Nuyts compares the double-negation construction like "It is not improbable that they have run out of fuel" with its counterpart without negation "It is probable that they have run out of fuel", and concludes that the former clearly suggests a higher degree of subjectivity than the latter, hence more epistemic than evidential. In general, then, the majority of modals do not inherently express evidentiality as an additional qualificational category. The occasional evidentiality of modal verbs and adverbs are contextualized, and such contexts are most likely to be found in scientific writing. Similarly, the evidentiality of modal adjectives is conditioned by their impersonal syntactic structure. It is in these specially conditioned occasions that evidential modals can acquire a hedging flavor. Otherwise, there is a tendency that the more evidential a modal expression is the less it is possible to be invoked as a hedge. Therefore, the modals' ability to hedge is mostly due to their epistemic reading, and sometimes due to their deontic and dynamic reading, but rarely due to their evidential reading. ....

<<英语缓冲语的语用发展>>

版权说明

本站所提供下载的PDF图书仅提供预览和简介, 请支持正版图书。

更多资源请访问:<http://www.tushu007.com>