

战争合法化的话语策略

——美国总统阿富汗战争演讲的批评话语分析

林予婷¹ 苗兴伟²

(1. 香港城市大学英语系, 中国香港 999077; 2. 北京师范大学外国语言文学学院, 北京 100875)

摘要: 本研究从批评话语分析的角度出发,以 van Leeuwen 的“合法化”话语策略为分析框架,对 50 篇美国总统阿富汗战争演讲中合法化话语策略的分布、实现方式和运作机制进行了分析。研究揭示了这些演讲如何运用合法化话语策略建构正义的“我方”、非正义的“他方”,将本质残酷、颇具争议的战争建构为目的高尚、动机正当、广受支持的合法行为。

关键词: 合法化; 话语策略; 批评话语分析; 战争语篇

DOI:10.13458/j.cnki.flatt.004294

中图分类号: H0 文献标识码: A 文章编号: 1004-6038(2016)05-0059-10

1. 引言

合法化(legitimation)是运用话语策略赋予事物合法性的话语实践(Martin-Rojo & van Dijk, 1997: 560)。亚里士多德在 *The Politics* 中指出,合法化是语言的重要功能之一,“人类作为政治动物……通过语言暗示着何为有利或有害,何为公平或不公”(Aristotle, 1998)。在批评话语分析的视角下,合法化指基于社会道德规范与价值观,赋予事物合理性、正当性、恰当性的言语行为(Suchman, 1995: 574)。广义来说,凡能回答“为什么”这一问题的,如“为什么要做这件事?”或“为什么要这样做这件事?”都属于合法化的范畴(van Leeuwen, 2008)。合法化的批评话语研究主要关注争议性的社会问题,如移民、战争、商业竞争等。如 Martin-Rojo 和 van Dijk(1997)讨论了移民语篇中合法化策略的语法、语义、修辞、文体特点,区分了合法化策略的语用、语义、社会政治层面;van Leeuwen 和 Wodak(1999)运用系统功能语法,考察了奥地利政府官员在移民拒签信中使用的合法化话语策略,等等。合法化的批评话语分析有助于我们考察语篇隐藏的意识形态,揭示说话者如何巧妙地运用话语策略,赋予原本不公正、不道德的事物合法地位。(Fairclough & Fairclough 2012)

战争合法化指将争议性的战争建构为公正合理、广受支持的合法行为(van Dijk, 2005)。批评话语分析研究表明,战争语篇中包含丰富的合法化策略。如 Martin-Rojo(1995)在海湾战争语篇的批评分析中,总结出媒体合法化“我方”、非法化“他方”的话语策略;van Dijk(2005)从语篇和认知角度出发,研究了政治语篇中伊拉克战争的合法化;Oddo(2011)讨论了战争时期美国总统演讲中“我方”和“他方”的身份建构;Peled-Elhanan(2010)探讨了以色列中学历史课本中暴力冲突的合法化;庞超伟(2013)探究了伊拉克战争语篇中评价资源对战争合法性的话语建构,等等。

作者简介: 林予婷, 博士生, 研究方向: 批评话语分析; 苗兴伟, 教授, 博士, 博士生导师, 研究方向: 功能语言学, 语篇分析。
第一作者邮箱: linyutingtina@gmail.com

已有的合法化研究多采用批评话语分析维也纳学派倡导的“语篇-历史”视角(Discourse-Historical Approach, 参见 Wodak & Meyer 2009), 重点考察合法化言语行为的社会、文化和政治语境, 对合法化话语策略的语言特点关注较少, 如 van Leeuwen 和 Wodak (1999)、Zhu 和 Mckenna (2012) 对合法化策略的“语篇-历史”分析。此外, 大部分研究聚焦于语篇个案, 采用的语料比较有限, 如 Oddo (2011) 针对四篇美国总统演讲进行了话语分析。最后, 现有研究主要围绕“合法化”的概念展开讨论, 较少运用系统的合法化理论分析框架, 如庞超伟 (2013) 对伊拉克战争的讨论。鉴于此, 本文对合法化的研究将基于一定规模的语料, 并以 van Leeuwen (2008) 提出的合法化经典理论为分析框架, 重点关注合法化话语策略的语言特点、实现方式与运作机制, 探讨说话者如何巧妙地利用合法化话语策略表达自己的观点。

2. 研究设计

本研究从批评话语分析视角出发, 对美国总统阿富汗战争演讲中的合法化话语策略类别、实现方式、运行机制进行分析。研究探讨了以下问题:

- (1) 阿富汗战争语篇中运用了哪些合法化话语策略?
- (2) 语篇中合法化话语策略的典型实现方式是什么?
- (3) 语篇中合法化话语策略的运行机制是什么?

研究语料来源为 2001 至 2013 年发表于美国白宫官方网站(www.whitehouse.gov) 的美国总统阿富汗战争演讲。以演讲标题中出现“阿富汗战争”为筛选标准, 收录 50 篇语料 (George W. Bush 32 篇; Barack Obama 18 篇), 建立约 10.43 万词的小型语料库。

本研究的语料分析框架为 van Leeuwen (2007; 2008) 提出的合法化理论。该理论主要用于揭示公共语篇中的意识形态和权力关系, 在语篇分析, 尤其是批评话语分析中得到了广泛的应用 (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012)。van Leeuwen (2008) 认为, 语言是实现合法化的核心手段, 任何角度的合法化都可以通过特定的语言资源和形式得以实现。基于此, 他将合法化的话语策略分为四类: 权威化策略(authorization)、正当化策略(moralization)、合理化策略(rationalization)、寓言讲述策略(mythopoesis)。每类策略又包含若干具体手段。表 1 归纳了 van Leeuwen 提出的合法化话语策略与手段:

表 1 合法化策略的类别与手段 (van Leeuwen 2008)

合法化策略	具体手段
权威化策略 authorization	惯例 custom
	权威 authority
	推荐 recommendation
正当化策略 moralization	评价 evaluation
	抽象化 abstraction
	比较 comparison
合理化策略 rationalization	手段合理化 instrumental rationalization
	理论合理化 theoretical rationalization

根据表 1 所示的合法化策略理论框架(注:因篇幅所限,合法化策略与手段的具体定义与实现方式详见本文第 3 节),使用语料库软件 UAM Corpus Tool,对语料中的合法化策略以小句为单位进行了标注与统计,并对各类策略的典型实现方式进行了归纳,以探究“阿富汗战争语篇中运用了哪些合法化话语策略?”及“语篇中合法化话语策略的典型实现方式是什么?”为探究“语篇中合法化话语策略的运行机制是什么?”本文对语料中合法化策略的运用进行了批评分析,通过讨论合法化策略对“战争”、“我方”、“敌方”三个维度的话语建构,解析了战争语篇的合法化机制。语篇分析综合运用了批评话语研究常用的一些语言分析工具,主要包括:运用系统功能语言学中的及物性分析(transitivity analysis,参见 Halliday,1994),解析了语篇对战争中暴力动作的建构;借鉴评价理论中的态度系统(参见 Martin & White,2005),讨论了语篇对战争和参战者的主观评判;参考语用学中关于第一人称代词的指称研究(参见 Levinson,1983),探讨了语篇对“我们”的身份建构;用语料库软件 AntConc 对战争参与者的身份描述语进行了词频统计,等等。下文将具体展示战争语篇中合法化话语策略的分布、实现方式与运行机制。

3. 战争语篇中合法化话语策略的分布与实现方式

根据 van Leeuwen(2008)对合法化策略的分类与定义,语料中共找到 1144 例合法化策略,每千词约 10.97 例。各类合法化策略的分布如表 2 所示:

表 2 阿富汗战争语篇中的合法化策略分布

合法化策略	具体手段	频次	频次/千词	百分比
权威化策略(n=223,19.49%)	惯例	175	16.77	15.30%
	权威	34	3.26	2.98%
	推荐	14	1.34	1.22%
正当化策略(n=182,15.91%)	评价	92	8.82	8.04%
	抽象化	65	6.23	5.68%
	比较	25	2.4	2.19%
合理化策略(n=711,62.15%)	手段合理化	547	52.45	47.81%
	理论合理化	164	15.72	14.33%
寓言讲述策略(n=28,2.45%)	正面性寓言	16	1.53	1.40%
	警示性寓言	12	1.15	1.05%
总计		1144	10.967	100.00%

如表 2 所示,语料中最为常见的合法化策略为合理化策略(共 711 例,占 62.15%),次之为权威化(共 223 例,占 19.49%)、正当化(共 182 例,占 15.91%),寓言讲述策略的使用比较有限(共 28 例,占 2.45%)。下文将举例说明四类合法化策略的定义和实现方式。

3.1 权威化策略

权威化策略(authorization)指引述权威人士富有说服力的观点,证明事物的合法

性。战争权威化主要利用了建构集体权威的“惯例”手段(custom ,78.47%) ,通过描述众多的战争支持者 ,强调战争是“得道多助”的正义事业 ,如“Many nations around the world have joined with us in this cause”。集体权威的建构常常涉及高频率情态(如“most nations”)、集体指称(如“we”、“our forefathers”)、抽象化表述(如“the collective will of the world”)。

此外 战争权威化还使用了建构个体权威的“权威”(authority) 和“推荐”(recommendation) 手段 ,指出战争受到权威个人或机构的支持。此类权威包括政府领导人等“个人权威”(11.21%) ,如“British Prime Minister”;政府机构、国际条例等“客观权威”(4.04%) ,如“U. S. Congress、Article 5 of NATO”;道德高尚者的“模范推荐”(5.38%) ,如“a 4th-grade girl with a father in the military”等等。

3.2 正当化策略

正当化策略(moralization) 指援引道义准则和价值观 ,对事物进行正面评价。战争语篇中 ,超过半数的正当化策略使用了“评价”手段(evaluation ,50.55%) ,在关系过程中直接赋予战争及其参与者正面品质 ,如“our cause is just” ,“U. S. troops are serving courageously and capably”。

正当化策略的另一重要手段“抽象化”(abstraction ,35.71%) 指在高度概括的、通常富有比喻义的语言中嵌入对战争的隐性评价 ,如将战争喻为“the cause of peace and freedom”、“the cause of liberty”。此类抽象化表达激发了预设的语用效果 ,显得自然而有说服力。(Levinson ,1983)

正当化策略还使用了“比较”手段(comparison ,13.73%)。语篇通过正面对比 ,指出阿富汗战争和其它正义战争性质相同;或使用反衬手法 ,将阿富汗战争和美国史上评价较低的战争区别开来 ,如“Unlike Vietnam ,we are joined by a broad coalition of 43 nations that recognizes the legitimacy of our action”。

3.3 合理化策略

合理化策略(rationalization) 描述了事物的内在逻辑和外走向 ,表现事物的诞生和发展自然合理。合理化是战争语篇中最常见的合法化策略。其中“手段合理化”(instrumental rationalization) (76.93%) 将战争看作达成目标的有效手段 ,展示了战争的正当目的和合理动机。在战争目标的建构中 ,语篇使用了丰富的物质过程小句 ,如“we’re fighting for the security of our people and the success of liberty” ,描述美国打击恐怖主义、保卫国土安全、解放阿富汗的正义目的。在战争动机的描述中 ,语篇使用了大量的否定结构 ,如“we didn’t choose the war” ,开脱美国发起战争的责任。

“理论合理化”(theoretical rationalization) (23.07%) 关注战争及参战者的性质 ,强调战争的存在合情合理 ,符合参战者的性格特点。如“Americans don’t flinch in the face of difficult truths or difficult tasks” ,表现美国人民性格坚韧、对敌人无所畏惧 ,参战因而是美国民族精神的最佳体现。

3.4 寓言讲述

寓言讲述策略(mythopoesis) 指叙述富有寓意的故事 ,暗示事物将带来美好结局。语篇中 16 则“正面性寓言”(moral tale) 讲述了反法西斯战争等正义军事行动 ,寓意阿富汗战争

也将消灭邪恶势力,带来民主与和平。12 则“警示性寓言”(cautionary tale)回顾了中东地区纵容恐怖主义等历史教训,指出撤离阿富汗、放纵敌人将导致危险后果。寓言讲述策略所需篇幅较长,在简短的演讲中并不多见,本文因此不再详述。

4. 战争语篇中合法化策略的运行机制

战争合法化包括两个方面:武装冲突的合法化,即“战争”行为本身的合法化;参战实体的合法化,即“我方”合法化和“敌方”非法化。下文将从“战争”、“我方”、“敌方”三个维度,解析战争语篇的合法化机制。

4.1 合法化策略对“战争”的概念建构

“战争”概念的话语建构主要使用了合理化和正当化策略。合理化策略建构战争的正当动机和积极目的,正当化策略运用了丰富的评价资源(Martin & White 2005),建构战争的正义性和重要性。

4.1.1 战争的动机建构 “回应挑衅”与“正当防御”

战争动机的建构主要由“动机”维度的手段合理化策略实现。语篇中的战争动机分为“敌方归因”和“我方归因”两类,如表 3 所示:

表 3 阿富汗战争的动机建构

动机类型		例子	频次	百分比
敌方归因 (77.63%)	直接动机: “9-11”事件	It (the war) came to our shores when al Qaeda launched the 9/11 attacks from Afghanistan.	22	28.95%
	深层动机: 敌方威胁	Given the means our enemies would be a threat to every nation and eventually to civilization itself.	37	48.68%
我方归因 (22.37%)	免责声明	We did not choose this war. This was not an act of America wanting to expand its influence.	14	18.42%
	寻求正义	They must pay a price [...] because we seek justice.	3	3.95%
总计			76	100%

如表 3 所示,语篇将战争起因主要归结于“敌方”的挑衅和威胁(77.63%)。22 处例子表明,敌方策划的“9-11”恐怖袭击(“the 9/11 attacks”)对美国人民造成巨大伤害,成为了阿富汗战争的导火索。此外,37 处例子指出敌方构成的恐怖主义威胁是阿富汗战争的深层动机,敌人有可能成为“世界各国乃至人类文明的巨大威胁”(“a threat to every nation and eventually to civilization itself”)。阿富汗战争因而是美国对敌方挑衅和威胁的合理回应。

语篇将战争起因部分归结于“我方”自身(22.37%)。但仅有三处例子说明了战争源于“我方”对正义的诉求(because we seek justice),其余 14 例均属于为“我方”开脱责任的“免责声明”,澄清美国参战“并非出于自愿”(“We did not choose this war”),也非抱有“扩大国际影响”的不当意图(“This was not an act of America wanting to expand its influence”)。为“我方”开脱责任,将战争责任完全归咎于敌方,是“我方”自我辩护的重要手段。

4.1.2 战争的目的建构 “积极建设”与“消极破坏”

战争的目的建构主要由“目的”维度的合理化策略实现。战争的本质是暴力冲突,难免造成破坏性后果。然而语篇提及战争的破坏性目标——武装打击塔利班政权的同时,还强

调了战争解放阿富汗、保障国土安全、维护世界和平的建设性目的,如表4所示:

表4 阿富汗战争的目的建构

战争目的		例子	频次	百分比
破坏性目的	打击敌人	Our new strategy has a clear mission and defined goals: to disrupt, dismantle and defeat al Qaeda and its extremist allies.	214	46.62%
建设性目的	重建阿富汗	We've averted mass starvation, begun clearing mine fields, rebuilding roads and improving health care.	245	53.38%
	保障国土安全	We are fighting to protect ourselves and our children from violence and fear.		
	维护世界和平	We want to lay the foundation of peace for generations to come.		
总计			459	100%

如表4所示,语篇提到的建设性、破坏性目的比例相当。阿富汗战争的破坏性目的可概括为奥巴马政府反复强调的“瓦解、捣毁和击败‘基地’组织”(“to disrupt, dismantle and defeat al Qaeda”)。常用的“破坏性”动词还包括 *destroy*、*break*、*devastate*、*severe*、*damage*、*attack*、*kill*、*capture*、*seize*、*topple*、*hunt down*、*tear apart*、*rout out* 等。破坏性动作有时用被动语态表示,如:

(1) High-ranking al Qaeda and Taliban leaders **have been killed**. [...] al Qaeda **was scattered** and many of its operatives **were killed**. The Taliban **was driven from power**.

从系统功能语法及物性分析(transitivity analysis)的角度来看,例(1)中的三个物质小句均为被动语态,省略了破坏性动作 *kill*、*scatter*、*drive from power* 的施事者“我方”(Halliday, 1994)。语篇中“我方”的破坏性动作约有10%为被动形式,使“我方”的武装暴力得到了语言上的模糊处理。

阿富汗战争的建设性目的主要包括三类:解放和建设阿富汗民主社会,如 *liberate*、*free*、*help*、*build*、*rebuild*、*establish*、*improve*、*strengthen*、*bring a better life to*;保卫美国国土安全,如 *protect*、*defend*、*keep secure*;维护世界和平,如 *lay the foundation of peace*、*advance the cause of freedom*。语篇有意强调战争的积极贡献,弱化战争的残酷,以展现战争有着比消灭敌人“更为远大的目标”(“America has a much greater purpose”)将战争合法化。

4.1.3 战争的性质建构 “正义公平”和“意义深远”

战争性质的话语建构主要由正当化策略实现。从评价理论的角度来看,正当化策略建构了对战争道德价值(如 *just*、*noble*、*right*、*selfless*)、重要性(如 *vital*、*great*、*important*、*essential*、*necessary*、*fundamental*、*historic*)的判断评价(Martin & White, 2005)。语篇中约30%的战争评价为显性评价,即使用“评价”手段的正当化策略,将战争的品质直接表述为系统功能语法关系过程中的“属性”(attribute),如“our cause is just”。超过60%的战争评价为隐性评价,即通过“抽象化”手段的正当化策略,将评价意义嵌入隐喻色彩的名物化词组,如将战争喻为“civilization's fight”、“freedom's fight”、“the cause of liberty”、“the noble cause of peace”,巧妙地表达了对战争的积极评价。

4.2 合法化策略对“我方”的身份建构

社会建构主义认为,战争合法化作为一种社会行为,直接参与了“我方”和“他方”作为

“社会活动参与者”(“social actor”)的动态身份建构(Berger & Luckmann, 1966)。战争语篇通过词汇重复、人称指示、以及对人物可靠性、恰当性、能力性的判断评价,将“我方”建构为团结可靠、坚韧精锐的民主斗士。

4.2.1 “我方”的身份建构:国际盟友、国内舆论和阿富汗民众支持

“我方”身份建构主要由协商一致性的权威化策略实现。“惯例”手段的权威化策略将国际盟友、美国人民、阿富汗平民都建构为“我方”成员,以表现战争的合法性广为认可。图1是基于语料库词频统计的“词云”(word cloud),图中单词字号越大、位置越中心,代表该词在“我方”身份的语言描述中出现频率越高。



图1 基于“我方”身份描述词频统计的“词云”

如图1所示,“国际同盟”是“我方”最凸显的身份属性。词云中最显眼的“联盟”一词(“the coalition”)在语篇中出现27次,“同盟国”(“ally”)19次,“合作伙伴”(“partner”)13次,“北约”(“NATO”)15次,“英国”(“Britain”、“the United Kingdom”)7次,证明国际盟友在“我方”阵营具有重要地位。即使在篇幅简短的演讲中,说话者也一一列举了众多盟国,如:

(2) We are joined in this operation by **our staunch friend, Great Britain. Other close friends including Canada, Australia, Germany and France** have pledged forces as the operation unfolds. **More than 40 countries in the Middle East, Africa, Europe and across Asia** have granted air transit or landing rights. **Many more** have shared intelligence. We are supported by **the collective will of the world.**

例(2)指出,超过四十个国家表态支持战争,英、加、澳、德、法等国更提供武力支持,可见“我方”行动得到了“全世界集体意志”(“the collective will of the world”)的一致认可。

“我方”成员还包括团结对外的美国人民。语篇31次强调了美国民众(“American”、“America”)对战争的一致支持,如“everybody in America appreciates it [the War]”。此外,14例“包括听话者”的集体指称“we”(we-inclusive-of-addressee)将全体听话者建构为战争的拥护者,如“We’ll stand together”。从语用学的角度来看,“we”这一集体指称的使用有助于强调集体属性、构建群组和谐(Levinson, 1983: 69),建构出团结一心的“我方”形象。

有趣的是,本应是敌国的阿富汗也被建构为“我方”的一员。语篇24次提及了阿富汗人民(“Afghan”、“Afghanistan”)对战争的支持。如:

(3) Together with **the determined people of Afghanistan**, we are making hopeful gains.

如例3所示,语篇多次表明美国与阿富汗平民并肩作战,为实现社会变革而共同努力,暗示了“我方”并非侵略者,而是阿富汗民众值得信赖的合作伙伴。

4.2.2 “我方”的品质建构

“我方”品质主要由正当化、合理化策略建构,从评价理论的可靠性、恰当性、能力性三个维度,赋予“我方”多重积极属性。(Martin & White 2005)

(a) “我们”是值得信赖的“我方”可靠性的评价

语篇从可靠性角度,塑造了“我们”值得信赖的勇士形象。正当化策略刻画了“我方”的勇气(如 *courageous*、*heroic*、*brave*)、参战决心(如 *resolute*、*determined*、*resolved*)、毅力(如 *persevering*、*patient*、*lasting commitment*)和忠诚(如 *loyal*、*trusted*、*dedicated*、*patriotic*)。此外,可靠性还体现在合理化策略对“我方”内在秉性的描述中,如“The United States of America does not quit once it starts on something”,反映了美国人民一旦参战、绝不半途而废的民族性格。

(b) “我们”是正义的“我方”恰当性的评价

语篇从恰当性角度,展示“我方”追求自由、热爱和平,极具正义感。正当化策略将我方抽象化为自由和正义的化身,如“the forces of moderation”、“the forces of liberty”。此外,合理化策略建构了“我方”热爱自由、追求平等、尊重人权的民族精神,如“We believe that freedom is the right of every single person”、“The United States of America will always stand up for the dignity of human beings”,暗示“我方”与生俱来的正义品质。

(c) “我们”是精锐的“我方”能力性的评价

语篇从能力性角度,将美军描写为经验丰富、能力超群的精锐部队。常见的评价资源如 *skillful*、*capable*、*extraordinary*、*best of our military* 等等。能力性评价常常使用一些相对夸张的语言,如称赞美军为“美国最优秀的一代人”(“the very greatest of American generations”),甚至“世界史上最强大的武装力量”(“the greatest fighting force in the history of the world”)。这些看似夸大的说辞常见于面向军队的演讲中,起到了鼓舞士气的作用。

4.3 合法化策略对“敌方”的身份建构

与“我方”形成鲜明对比的是“敌方”的反面形象。建构“敌方”和“我方”身份的手段大体相同,即词汇重复、人称指示、评价资源的使用等。此外,“反衬”手法的正当化策略将“我方”和“敌方”置于对比,凸显了正邪之分。

4.3.1 “敌方”的身份建构:残忍邪恶的恐怖分子

“我方”被塑造为英勇正义的民主斗士,“敌方”则是残忍邪恶的恐怖分子。“我方”军队的指称语大多是中性的,如 *forces*、*the military*、*troops*,或包含积极意义的,如 *heroic Afghan fighters*、*brave souls*、*the forces of liberty*;而敌方的指称语均为贬义,如 *the terrorists*、*the extremists*、*evil people*、*haters of humanity*、*the thugs*、*the killers*。语篇多处对比了“我方”和“敌方”的身份属性,如:

(4) There is no neutral ground in the fight between **civilization and terror**, because there is

no neutral ground between **good and evil freedom and slavery and life and death.**

例(4)使用抽象化手段,暗喻“敌方”代表恐怖(“terror”)、邪恶(“evil”)、奴隶制(“slavery”)和死亡(“death”),而“我方”则代表文明(“civilization”)、善良(“good”)、自由(“freedom”)和生命(“life”),善恶之分一目了然。

4.3.2 “敌方”的品质建构 “他们”是冷血残暴的

“我方”被赋予可靠、正义、精锐的优秀品质,而“敌方”则疯狂、冷血与残暴。语篇多次指出,敌人是“法西斯的继承人”(“the heirs to fascism”),二者“同样渴求权力,同样蔑视人权,同样具有疯狂的野心”(“the same will to power, the same disdain for the individual, the same mad global ambitions”)。“敌方”还作为施事者做出了种种暴力行为,如 *attack*、*kill*、*destroy*、*condone murder*、*hijack*、*take the life of* 等,这些动作均反映出“敌方”的残忍本质。语篇多次对比了“我方”与“敌方”的品质,如:

(5) Al Qaeda and the violent extremists who you're fighting against **want to destroy**. But all of you **want to build**. [...] They've got **no respect for human life**. You see **dignity in every human being**. [...] They **want to drive races and regions and religions apart**. You **want to bring people together and see the world move forward together**. They **offer fear** in other words, and you **offer hope**.

如例(5)所示,“敌方”意图摧毁(“destroy”),“他们”蔑视生命、制造分歧,带来恐惧和绝望;而“我方”意在建设(“build”),“我们”尊重人权、呼吁团结,创造和平与希望。“敌方”之残暴与“我方”之正义反差强烈,阿富汗战争作为正义对邪恶的讨伐而得到合法化。

5. 小结

本研究揭示了战争语篇中的合法化策略如何对“战争”、“我方”、“敌方”概念进行多层次、多方面的动态建构,使其在话语中得到形成、界定、说明、乃至合法化(van Dijk, 1993)。语篇以此表现了正义的“我方”、邪恶的“他方”,将本质残酷、颇具争议的战争建构为目的高尚、动机正当、广受支持的合法行为。

美国总统阿富汗战争演讲中存在丰富的合法化策略,这是由政治语篇的本质和战争的性质决定的。语篇是传播意识形态的关键途径,是“建构想象共同体的重要工具”(Martin, 1995: 8),政治语篇更是政客建构现实、输出观点、影响舆论的核心手段之一(van Dijk, 1997)。在社会不乏对阿富汗战争的质疑声音之时,面向全国民众的政治演讲尤其需要使用巧妙的语言策略,对战争的合法性进行有效建构,以说服对政府决定存疑的公众。在这样的语境中,合法化策略无疑提供了隐性地、有效地表达观点的语言资源。通过使用合法化策略,演讲者无需直接评价战争合法与否,而是采取塑造“我方”英雄形象、建构“他方”恐怖主义身份、强调战争高尚目的和正当动机等合法化手段,淡化战争残酷的本质,委婉地传达了“战争是合法的”这一论点。可以说,合法化策略的使用反映了说话者可能隐藏的交际目的。因此,对战争演讲中合法化策略的批评分析,有助于揭示语篇中隐性表达的意识形态倾向,使我们更好地认识政治语篇的本质。

参考文献:

- [1] Aristotle. 1998. *The Politics* [M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [2] Berger P. & T. Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* [M]. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [3] Fairclough J. & N. Fairclough. 2012. *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students* [M]. Oxon: Routledge.
- [4] Halliday M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd Edition) [M]. London: Edward Arnold.
- [5] Levinson S. 1983. *Pragmatics* [M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Martin D. 1995. The choices of identity [J]. *Social Identities* (1): 5-20.
- [7] Martin J. & P. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English* [M]. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [8] Martin-Rojo J. 1995. Division and rejection: From the personification of the Gulf conflict to the demonization of Saddam Hussein [J]. *Discourse and Society* (1): 49-80.
- [9] Martin-Rojo J. & T. van Dijk. 1997. "There was a problem and it was solved!": Legitimizing the expulsion of "illegal" migrants in Spanish parliamentary discourse [J]. *Discourse and Society* (4): 523-566.
- [10] Oddo J. 2011. War legitimization discourse: Representing "us" and "them" in four US presidential addresses [J]. *Discourse and Society* (3): 287-314.
- [11] Peled-Elhanan N. 2010. Legitimation of massacres in Israeli school history books [J]. *Discourse and Society* (4): 377-404.
- [12] Suchman M. 1995. Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches [J]. *The Academy of Management Review* (3): 571-610.
- [13] van Dijk T. 1993. Principles of critical discourse analysis [J]. *Discourse and Society* (2): 249-283.
- [14] van Dijk T. 1997. What is political discourse analysis? [J]. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* (1): 11-52.
- [15] van Dijk T. 2005. War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimization of the war in Iraq [J]. *Journal of Language and Politics* (1): 65-91.
- [16] van Leeuwen T. 2007. Legitimation in discourse and communication [J]. *Discourse and Communication* (1): 91-112.
- [17] van Leeuwen T. 2008. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis* [M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [18] van Leeuwen T. & R. Wodak. 1999. Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis [J]. *Discourse Studies* (1): 83-118.
- [19] Wodak R. & M. Meyer. 2009. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* [M]. London: Sage Publications.
- [20] Zhu Y. & B. McKenna. 2012. Legitimizing a Chinese takeover of an Australian iconic firm: Revisiting models of media discourse of legitimacy [J]. *Discourse and Society* (5): 525-552.
- [21] 庞超伟. 2013. 伊拉克战争合法性的话语重建——一项基于布什伊战演讲语料库的评价研究 [J]. *外语研究* (4): 41-48.



verbal processes cline ,this study finds that the intermediate cases on the three clines are influenced by the definiteness of the second participant ,the equativeness and tense of the process and the consciousness of the first participant respectively. Taking a topological perspective will make explicit the relevance between identifying processes and other processes types such as attributive , material ,verbal ,mental and existential ,so as to establish a comparatively comprehensive system of identifying processes and deepen the understanding of the transitivity system.

Key Words: Systemic Functional Linguistics; topology; identifying processes; cline

Constructing Positively-evaluated Face and Negatively-evaluated Face in Chinese Culture: An Identity Theory-based Approach ,p. 41. ZHOU Ling & ZHANG Shaojie

This research ,drawing on identity theories ,explores the culture-specific face-representation in Chinese. It adopted an empirical method ,specifically ,by surfing the key words *Miànzi* and *Liǎn* from the Sound Media Corpus of Communication University of China from which *V + Miànzi* and *V + Liǎn* collocations were extracted ,and then the data analysis was made in terms of their presentation levels ,frequencies ,and sensitive factors. Based on the results ,it analyzed the similarities and differences between *Miànzi* and *Liǎn*-representations from the self-presentation and face-sensitivity perspectives ,and finally constructed the two concepts Positively-evaluated Face and Negatively-evaluated Face which are exhibited as culture-specific face-representations in Chinese. The study finds that Positively-evaluated Face and Negatively-evaluated Face are characteristically distinguishable in Chinese culture ,but these two concepts are significantly different in their connotations from Positive Face and Negative Face proposed by Brown and Levinson. The finding further confirms that the English ethnocentric notions of Positive Face and Negative Face are not applicable to explaining the culture-specific face-representation in Chinese.

Key Words: face-representation; Positively-evaluated Face; Negatively-evaluated Face; Identity Theory

145

An Analysis of Power Trio in Three Different Genres in College English Textbooks ,p. 50. WU Geqi & ZHU Yongsheng

Power trio provides important linguistic resources for meaning construction and knowledge accumulation. This paper analyses the features of power trio in popular science texts ,social texts and literary texts in a College English Textbook. The results show that in the popular science texts ,the three power resources interact with each other to form the periodicity of semantic waves. In the social texts ,the semantic density is weaker ,and information flow is less regular than that in the popular science texts. Also ,power trio features in the literary texts are not evidently displayed due to its specific narration method. These findings can help college English teachers to get a better understanding of the knowledge codes in different fields and further improve the quality of College English teaching.

Key Words: College English; power trio; power word; power grammar; power composition

Discursive Strategies of War Legitimation: A Critical Discourse Analysis of American Presidential Speeches on the Afghanistan War ,p. 59. LIN Yuting & MIAO Xingwei

Adopting the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis and following the analytical framework of discursive strategies of legitimation developed by van Leeuwen ,this study examines the distribution ,realization and working mechanism of discursive strategies of legitimation in 50

pieces of American presidential speeches on the Afghanistan war. The study reveals how the discursive strategies of legitimation construct a righteous “us” and an evil “the other” in an effort to construct a cruel and controversial war as a legitimate action with noble purposes, reasonable motivation and wide support.

Key Words: legitimation; discursive strategies; critical discourse analysis; discourse of war

A Review of the Objectivity and Scientificity of Critical Discourse Analysis, p. 69. *GUO Qingmin*

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is often criticized for lacking explicitness, objectivity, reliability and verifiability, thus lacking scientificity. By clarifying and reviewing some major concepts and claims of CDA, the present paper tries to argue that if we follow some basic scientific principles and explicit operational procedures, obtain adequate linguistic data and make systematic use of multidisciplinary achievements and evidence, we can have our conclusions cross-examined to make them verifiable, thus endowing them with truth value. In this way, we can tremendously enhance the objectivity and scientificity of CDA.

Key Words: CDA; scientific principles; explicit research procedure; objectivity; scientificity

An Evolutionary Psychological Study of Critical Discourse Analysis, p. 78. *ZHANG Tianwei*

The paper reviews and introduces the theories and applications of Critical Discourse Analysis based on Evolutionary Psychology. The author maintains that the rationale of the integration between EP and CDA is modularity and coercion. Drawing on Hart's study (2010) and the EP theory, the paper analyzes the discourse strategies of news discourses and political discourse, including referential, predication, proximation and legitimizing strategies. It is argued that the theme of the integration of EP and CDA is to explore the relations between discourse strategies and modularity, and that their interaction is mainly realized by way of activation and operation. In other words, we can activate modules of Cheater-Detection and Emotion by way of predication strategy, or operate module of Logico-Rhetorical by way of legitimizing strategy.

Key Words: CDA; Evolutionary Psychology; Modularity; discourse strategy

Relation Inquiry of Tertiary EFL Teachers' Knowledge and Their Teaching Autonomy, p. 88. *LI Siqing & CHEN Jianlin*

This article attempts to interpret teaching autonomy in view of teacher knowledge and to explore the correlation of the dual factors. The authors firstly selected five teachers as the research cases and collected their knowledge data through interviews and class observations. The knowledge from the interview data was regarded as the descriptive one and the knowledge by observation as the external. The study then conducted a comparative analysis of the dual knowledge. It is found that the case teachers' descriptive knowledge is correlated with their observational one and that their knowledge shapes their teaching autonomy to some extent. It is argued that EFL teachers' knowledge has a crucial effect on their teaching autonomy, and that teacher's knowledge can be regarded as a practical perspective in teaching autonomy inquiry.

Key Words: teacher autonomy; teaching autonomy; EFL teaching; EFL teachers' knowledge

A Study on University EFL Teacher Engagement with Discipline and Literature: The Activity Theory Perspective, p. 97. *MENG Chunguo & CHEN Liping*

