

摘 要

本文在概念隐喻理论、原型范畴理论以及概念合成理论关照下,基于自建语料数据库,结合量化分析,透视汉英“N+N→N”构型名名隐转喻复合义的共相与殊相。通过对汉语 1,111 个以及英语 493 个名名隐转喻复合词语料的对比分析,从宏观上考察汉英名名隐转喻复合义对比的“三个模式”,即语义复合模式、语义凸显模式与隐转喻模式,从微观上对比分析汉英名名隐转喻复合构词级差的“三个维度”,即成分名词的隐转喻复合构词级差,隐转喻多义化级差以及名名互构隐转喻化构词级差,并在此基础上,对隐转喻层级性作出“际关系”与“内关系”两个层面上的划分,探讨汉英名名隐转喻复合义的共相与殊相。

研究发现,汉英名名隐转喻复合义的共相与殊相主要表现在以下四个方面。

(1) 在语义复合模式的共相方面,汉英名名隐转喻复合中部分语义角色被隐转喻思维优先关注并被凸显;语义角色的凸显、压制,以及语义复合模式均体现出层级性。此外,汉英语言中的部分语义角色、语义复合模式存在重合部分,且重合中亦有部分处于各自层级的上层。由此推断,汉英语言中可能均存在原型语义角色与原型语义复合模式。我们认为,其共相是由语言的普遍特征与普遍共性决定的。

二者的殊相则在于,成分名词所承担的语义角色在数量上以及广度上存在差异,其中汉语名名隐转喻复合中成分名词的语义角色更为丰富,且其语义复合模式更为多样化,该差异由汉英两种语言的语言类型以及语言环境中认知主体对于事物观察视角的不同,以及事物的属性与特征被凸显的层级性决定。

(2) 在语义凸显模式的共相方面,二者共享大部分语义凸显模式,其中“属性+特征(处所)”、“属性+特征(外形)”、“属性+属性”,以及“特征(处所)+属性”四类模式处于模式凸显层级的上层;特征、属性范畴以及功能范畴三者凸显层级由强至弱依次为“特征范畴>功能范畴>属性范畴”,且特征范畴内部次范畴的凸显亦呈现层级性,“外形”范畴与“处所”范畴均占据特征范畴内部凸显层级之首。该共相亦由语言的普遍特征与普遍共性而决定。

二者间的殊相则在于,在最易于被凸显的特征范畴中,除汉英共有的“外形”、“处所”范畴外,英语中最易于被凸显的范畴尚有“工具”、“目标”与抽象层面的“相似”;在频率最高的凸显模式中,汉语比英语多出一类重复型凸显模式,即“特征(外形)+特征(外形)”,而英语中“属性+功能”模式频率最高。该殊

相是由汉语的空间性特质与英语的时间性特质所决定的,同时亦受到认知主体以及汉、英语言中名名隐转喻复合语义的词化程度差异的影响,其背后是成分名词的物性结构在起作用,而其根本的认知动因,则在于等级凸显机制。

(3) 在隐转喻模式的共相方面,两种语言中隐喻模式与转喻模式的分布频率均相差不大,同时隐、转喻的分布也较为接近,且二者均为隐转喻义的通达路径; $N_{本}+N_{隐}$ 模式在两种语言中均具有绝对优势,而 $N_{隐}+N_{转}$ 模式在两种语言中则均处劣势;此外,均易于基于相似性发生隐喻的范畴为属性、外形、处所范畴,均易于基于相邻性发生转喻的范畴为属性、处所、功能范畴;其中,基于属性与功能范畴的转喻均分布最广,表明汉英转喻思维对于属性、功能范畴的广泛关注。其背后的动因在于,隐喻与转喻是人类思维的基本认知方式,是基本概念范畴语义衍化的通达路径,也是汉英名名复合中语义通达的认知路径。

二者间的殊相则在于,汉语第一、二层次总体上,隐喻相对于转喻占有相对优势,而在英语里转喻占有相对优势;汉语中的 $N_{本}+N_{本}$ 具有相对优势, $N_{转}+N_{转}$ 具有相对劣势,而英语中的 $N_{转}+N_{本}$ 具有相对优势, $N_{隐}+N_{隐}$ 处于相对劣势;汉语中成分名词隐喻化的分布更广,而英语中转喻化分布更广;隐喻思维在汉语里更偏重于抽象相似性的隐喻,在英语里则关注较少。汉语“工具”、“目标”、“结果”范畴的相似性分布更广,英语中基于具象外形相似与抽象相似的隐喻分布最广,且基于具象外形的相似明显优于抽象相似范畴;汉语中尚有基于具象与抽象层面相似范畴基础上的转喻,英语中则并未发现该类情形的存在,表明汉语中的转喻思维相对于英语更偏向于对事物外形以及抽象层面上的相邻性的关注。此外,英语的转喻思维更关注“工具”与“目标”范畴。其背后的动因,我们初步推断,可能在于语言的类型以及对于范畴的认知方式的不同。汉语系表意文字,偏重意合,其概念复合更偏重于概念范畴本身的联想与抽象化,其主流思维方式往往近取诸身,远取诸物,托物言志,属于离散型思维;英语系字母型文字,偏重形合,其形态变化往往基于“整体”与“部分”的范畴化,其中隐含转喻思维,体现为转喻思维的优势。此外,英语思维强调概念的认知可及性,而转喻基于相邻性,往往比隐喻更易于识解。

(4) 在汉英名名隐转喻复合构词级差的共相方面,愈趋近于原型范畴层级中心的名词,其隐转喻化能力与隐转喻多义化能力愈强,愈处于层级边缘的名词,其复合隐转喻化能力越弱,其隐转喻多义化能力则更弱;认知范畴在原型范畴层级中的相对位置或次序,与其名名复合隐转喻化能力成正比。该共相主要是由基本范畴概念本身在概念层级以及认知范畴中的基础与核心地位所决定的。

二者间的殊相则在于,汉语中名词范畴的名名隐转喻复合构词能力远高于英语,且名名复合隐转喻多义化能力更为突出,处于原型范畴边缘的范畴仍具隐转

喻复合构词能力，而英语则相对较弱，且处于原型范畴边缘的范畴其隐转喻复合构词能力更弱。我们认为，该殊相主要是由语言类型的差异决定的。汉语以分析型为主，通过概念范畴之间的灵活组合，基于隐喻与转喻，以名物为中心，重在“表意”；英语以综合型为主，以表音素的字母文字为书写系统，以行为动作为中心，而非以名物为中心，且往往通过词汇的形态变化来表达概念语义。

综上，汉英名名隐转喻复合义间的共相与殊相，均由汉英两种语言的语言类型以及两种语言环境中认知主体对于事物观察的视角的不同，以及事物的属性与特征被凸显的层级性而决定的。语言反映世界观，语言所构建的概念世界，均是对客观世界的概念化；同时，汉英语言又兼具各自的民族个性。汉、英语言所反映出的语言的普遍共性与民族特性，正是洞悉语言的共性与差异的根本性视角。

关键词：名名复合词；隐喻；转喻；构词；对比研究

Abstract

Guided by the theory of Conceptual Metaphor, the Prototype Theory, and the Conceptual Blending Theory in cognitive linguistics, this dissertation conducts a survey on contrastive analysis of similarities and differences in metaphorical, metonymic, metaphonymic and metonymaphorical noun-noun compounds both in the Chinese and English language by a case study of body-lexis-patterned noun-noun compounds from the perspective of quantitative and qualitative analysis. By the contrastive analysis of 1,111 Chinese metaphoric and/or metonymic noun-noun compounds patterned by 69 Chinese body lexis and 493 English counterparts patterned by 61 English body lexis, the dissertation examines: 1) three contrastive analysis models of metaphorical and/or metonymic noun-noun compounds in Chinese and English, i.e., the Semantic Compounding Model (SCM), the Semantic Prominence Model (SPM) and the Metaphor and/or Metonymy Compounding Model (MMCM), 2) three indicators of the metaphorized and/or metonymized noun-noun patterned word-formation, i.e., the hierarchy of N_1+N_2 metaphorical and/or metonymic compounding (N_1 and N_2 in different semantic fields), the hierarchy of metaphorical and/or metonymic polysemization, the hierarchy of N_1+N_2 metaphorical and/or metonymic compounding (N_1 and N_2 in the same semantic fields), and makes a technical distinction between the Inter-Relation and Inner-Relation among the complex metaphor-metonymy relations by discussing the internal hierarchy of metaphorized and/or metonymized noun-noun patterned word-formation.

Their similarities and differences are as follows:

(1) In terms of the SCM, in the Chinese and English metaphorical and/or metonymic noun-noun compounding, some semantic roles/case relations have priority of being metaphorized and/or metonymized, and all semantic roles/case relations indicate a hierarchy of prominence or coercion, and so does the SCM. Besides, in the semantic compounding both in Chinese and English, there are overlapping semantic roles/case relations and models at the upper level of their own hierarchies. We tentatively infer the existence of potential prototypical semantic roles/case relations and prototypical models of N+N compounding, and we presume that the similarities between the SCMs in both languages are determined by the common traits of languages.

However, there are differences in quantity and distribution of semantic roles

played by the component noun in both languages, and both the semantic roles and the SCM are more diversified in the Chinese metaphorized and/or metonymized N+N compounding. The differences of the SCMs are determined by the language typology, the diversified observing perspectives of cognizers in the two languages, and the hierarchy of property prominence and feature prominence.

(2) In terms of the SPM, the metaphorical and/or metonymic noun-noun compounding in Chinese and English share a majority of the SPMs, among which the models of Property+Feature(Locative), Property+Feature(appearance), Feature(locative)+Property are at the upper level of hierarchy; Besides, the feature category, the property category and the telic role (Pustejovsky, 1995) category are all prominent in compounding with the hierarchy of Feature>Telic Role>Property. Furthermore, the sub-feature categories are also hierarchical in prominence, among which the appearance and locative roles are both at the upper level. We assume that the similarities between the SCMs in both languages are also determined by the common traits of languages.

However, apart from the sharing appearance category and the locative category, the most easily prominent feature categories include the instrument category, the purpose category and the similarity-oriented categories at the abstract level in the English language; among the most frequent SPMs, the Property+ Telic model is the most; so it is with the Chinese SPMs, with an extra repetitive model of Feature(appearance)+Feature(appearance). We argue that the differences of the SPMs are determined by the spatial traits of the Chinese language and the temporal traits of the English language, meanwhile, they are influenced by the cognizers and the lexicalization of the metaphorized and/or metonymized noun-noun compounding in both languages, in which the qualia structure of nouns plays roles on the basis of the Graded Salience Hypothesis proposed by Giora (1997; 1999; 2003; 2004) .

(3) In terms of the MMCM, the distribution of metaphor, metonymy, metaphonymy and metonytaphor as accesses to the metaphoric, metonymic, metaphonymic and metonytaphoric meaning in both languages is more or less similar. The MMCM with N₁ retaining its original meaning and N₂ being metaphorized is in a dominant position, and the MMCM with N₁ and N₂ both being metaphorized is in an inferior position in both languages. Besides, the property category, appearance category and the locative category are most likely metaphorized based on similarities, and the property category, the locative category and the relic role category are most

likely metonymized based on contiguity. Furthermore, the property category and the telic role category are most widely distributed in the MMCMs. The motivation for the similarities is that human thought processes are largely metaphorical and metonymic in nature as Lakoff & Johnson (1980) noted, both metaphor and metonymy are the cognitive accesses to N+N compounding.

However, in the Chinese language, metaphor occupies a comparative advantage relative to metonymy at the first and the second level of compounding; In contrast, in the English language metonymy occupies a comparative advantage relative to metaphor. Additionally, among the Chinese MMCMs, the MMCM with both N_1 and N_2 retaining their original meaning has a comparative advantage, while the MMCM with both N_1 and N_2 being metonymized has a comparative disadvantage; among the English MMCMs, the MMCM with N_1 being metonymized and N_2 retaining its original meaning has a comparative advantage, while the MMCM with both N_1 and N_2 being metaphorized has a comparative disadvantage. The metaphorization of component nouns in Chinese is most widely distributed, while the metonymization in English is most widely distributed. Metaphor demonstrates a strong preference for the similarities at the abstract level in Chinese, while it rarely emphasizes the abstracted similarities in the process of compounding in English. The similarities based on the instrument, purpose and result categories are most widely distributed in Chinese, while the concrete and the abstract similarities are most widely distributed in English, and the concrete similarities have a comparative advantage to the abstract similarities. Surprisingly, metonymy is possibly based on the concrete and abstract similarities in Chinese, while it is not so in English. The fact indicates that, metonymy in Chinese comparatively has a preference for the concrete and abstracted similarities. While in English, metonymy has a preference for the instrument category and the purpose category.

The differences of the MMCMs, as we infer, are determined by the language typology and the ways of cognition. The Chinese language is an ideographic language, its conceptual blending is more oriented to association and abstraction of concepts themselves, and its mainstream thought is often to express ideas by drawing inspirations from nearby and afar and hold things to speech will with discrepancies. However, the English language is an alphabetic language with an orientation to hypotaxis, its morphological changes are often to categorize the Whole category and the Part category based on thought of metonymy in nature, which implies the

comparative advantage of metonymy to metaphor. In addition, metonymy emphasizes more cognitive accessibility in English than in Chinese. On the basis of contiguity, metonymy is more easily construed in the English language.

(4) In the hierarchy of N_1+N_2 metaphorical and/or metonymic compounding, the categories at the upper level are more likely metaphonymized, metonymaphorized, and/or polysemized, and the ones at the lower level are weaker in this respect, which is proportional to their relative positions or orders of categories in the hierarchy of the prototypical categories. We assume that the similarities between the hierarchy of N_1+N_2 metaphorical and/or metonymic compounding in both languages are determined by the basic or core position of conceptual categories, and their positions in cognition.

However, the metaphorized and/or metonymized noun-noun patterned word-formation in Chinese is stronger than that in English, and the polysemization of noun-noun patterned word-formation in Chinese is also much stronger, even the categories in the marginal area of the prototype categories can also form the metaphorized and/or metonymized noun-noun compounds; In English, in contrast, the metaphorized and/or metonymized noun-noun patterned word-formation is weaker, and the categories in the marginal area of the prototype categories rarely form the metaphorized and/or metonymized noun-noun compounds. We maintain that the differences of metaphorized and/or metonymized noun-noun patterned word-formation in both languages are also related to their language typology. The Chinese language is an analytic language in which concepts are flexibly compounded by means of metaphor and/or metonymy, with a focus of parataxis by noun concept and object concept. In contrast, the English language is of synthetic orientation with phonemes as its writing system. Besides, the English language is more prone to conceptualizing actions instead of noun concept and object concept.

To sum up, the differences and similarities of the metaphoric and metonymic $N+N$ Compounds both in the Chinese and English language are determined by the language typology, the diversified observing perspectives of cognizers in the two languages, and the hierarchy of property prominence and feature prominence. Languages reflect views to the physical world, and what languages construct is to conceptualize the world. The common traits and national differences reflected by the Chinese and English language are the root perspective of probing into the similarities and differences of the two languages.

Key Words: Noun-Noun Compound; Metaphor; Metonymy; Word-formation;
Contrastive Analysis