

图书基本信息

书名：<<学术论文的人际意义研究-外国语言学博士文库>>

13位ISBN编号：9787810679244

10位ISBN编号：7810679244

出版时间：2006-8

出版时间：青岛海洋大学出版社

作者：张延君

页数：266

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>

## 内容概要

《外国语言学博士文库：学术论文的人际意义研究》的目的是从语言的人际功能视角考察学术论文人际意义的构建与表述方式，这一目的决定了《外国语言学博士文库：学术论文的人际意义研究》在理论和应用上的双重动机。

在理论上，试图建构话语层面的人际意义模式，将系统功能语言学框架中的人际意义成分调整为同一层面上的三个相互交叉的语义成分，即认识性（epistemic）、评价性（evaluative）和磋商性（negotiative）。

这三个语义成分分别由不同的语言手段实现，它们共同描述词汇与语法手段的语义功能。

在应用上，试图将构建的三要素人际意义模式应用于学术论文的实际语料分析之中。

书中的语料由应用语言学和文学批评两个领域的学术论文组成，所分析的80篇学术论文选自以上领域的10种权威性学术期刊，语料的总字数约为55万字。

在构建的人际意义模式下，具体分析了模糊限制语（hedging）、人称（person）、评价词汇（evaluative lexis）和引用（citation）等四种语言资源在学术论文中的多重人际意义。

这四种人际语言资源通过四个章节分别进行了深入的分析，同时，它们之间在语义功能和实现手段等方面又存在着不同程度上的交叉。

书籍目录

序前言Chapter 1 Introduction1.1 Background to the Study1.2 A Brief Survey of Interpersonal Meaning1.3 Research Design1.4 Organization of the BookChapter 2 Towards a Functional Model of Interpersonal Meaning2.1 Introduction2.2 An Overview of Interpersonal Models2.3 A Three-Component Model of Interpersonal Meaning2.4 SummaryChapter 3 Modeling Interpersonal Features of Academic Discourse3.1 Introduction3.2 What Is Academic Discourse?3.3 Different Approaches to Academic Discourse3.4 A Description of Interpersonal Features of Academic Discourse3.5 Four Linguistic Devices to be Analyzed3.6 SummaryChapter 4 Hedging4.1 Introduction4.2 The Notion of Modality4.3 The Concept of Hedging4.4 Weighing the Claims in the Truth-Seeking Talk4.5 Mitigating Claims by Limiting Personal Commitment4.6 Gaining Reader Ratification for Claims4.7 SummaryChapter 5 Person5.1 Introduction5.2 The Notion of Person5.3 The Classifications and Functions of Varied We in RAs5.4 The Epistemic Meanings of I in RAs5.5 Uses of You Soliciting Reader Solidarity in RAs5.6 Tackling a Research Article from the Data5.7 The I/We Perspective of Knowledge Presentation in RAs5.8 SummaryChapter 6 Evaluative Lexis6.1 Introduction6.2 Approaches to the Definition of Evaluation6.3 Evaluation from a Linguistic Perspective6.4 Evaluation in RAs: Explicit Attitude versus Objectivity6.5 Dominant Choices in Expressing Explicit Attitude in RAs6.6 Dominant Choices in Grading Explicit Attitude in RAs6.7 SummaryChapter 7 Citation7.1 Introduction7.2 The Notion of Reported Speech7.3 The Conception of Citation in Evaluation7.4 The Classifications of Reporting Verbs7.5 Reporting Verbs Signaling Evaluation in RAs7.6 Evaluative Functions of Reporting Verbs in RAs7.7 The Complexity of Evaluation in the Citations of RAs7.8 SummaryChapter 8 Conclusions8.1 A Summarizing Overview8.2 Some Pedagogical Implications8.3 Suggestions for Further StudiesAppendix I The Corpus of Applied LinguisticsAppendix II The Corpus of Literary CriticismBibliographyList of FiguresList of TablesAbbreviations后记

## 章节摘录

dence in the truth of a proposition , but also an attitude to the audience ( Hyland , 2000 ) . From this view , hedges can be considered as the interac-tive elements which serve as a bridge between the prepositional informa-tion in the text and the writer's factual interpretation. In other words , hedging is not simply a prudent insurance against overstating an assertion , but also a rational interpersonal strategy which both supports the writer's position and builds writer-reader relationship.

Hedging is critical in AD because it helps gain communal acceptance for knowledge. Scientific truth is as much a social as an intellectual catego-ry , and the distinction writers make between their subject matter and howthey want their readers to understand their relationship to it is crucial tosuch a highly self-conscious form of discourse. Not only does it influencethe effectiveness and credibility of argumentation , but helps define what it means to write science. Degree of cognitive probability and generality often facilitate , or even determine , the comprehension of a message. The as-sessment of propositions therefore places epistemic modality in a criticalrole , because the selection of devices can influence the ratification of argu-ments. Effective academic writing is like any other kind of discourse in that it is interactive , it involves writers trying to influence their readers by persuading them of the correctness of their view , but arguments have to be expressed in ways that are acceptable , meaningful and plausible to the members in academic community. Here the main point for a writer is how to make his knowledge claims , which is in effect a process of wrestling with knowledge claims。

4. 3. 3. 1 Knowledge claims and scientific truth Scientific truth can be manipulated to persuade readers of the author's contribution to a debate , and hedges play a large part in accomplishing this. Writers may thus hedge their commitment to accepted knowledge , to new findings , or to what those findings mean.

Essentially , the goal of aca-demic writers is to establish their claims as facts , using the resources of the language to promote their work. Then a statement of a knowledgeclaim is at the heart of a RA , and the writer's purpose is to create a text.

.....

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>