

摘要

本研究旨在探讨英汉新闻语篇中的首都名的转喻义与非转喻义用法,依托来自语料库的真实语料,结合定量研究方法以挖掘自然语言中的首都转喻义用法背后的影响因素及动因。研究首先确定了“GIGA”和“BNC”中最高频的九个首都名,再分别从语料库中抽取首都名索引行,人工清理不属于本文研究对象的语料,并从清理结果中随机抽取汉语索引行 3058 条,英语索引行 1947 条;接着,从语义、句法、语篇等维度对目标索引行进行了 9 个自变量的标注;最后,借助逻辑斯蒂回归模型中对影响首都名转喻义分布的自变量进行定量分析,着重考察自变量语言与其他自变量之间的交互作用,并利用随机森林分析得到自变量分别在汉语和英语中的重要性排序。

统计分析结果显示: 1) 转喻作为人类认知方式之一,在各个语言中普遍存在,尤其是 CAPITAL FOR GOVERNMENT 这一转喻类型,在汉英语篇中都是最主要的转喻类型,可见此转喻类型已经固化; 2) 首都名转喻义的分布具有显著的跨语言差异,相较于汉语而言,英语使用首都名的转喻义用法频率更高;此外,首都名转喻类型的分布在汉语和英语中也有明显差异,英语中较为常见的 CAPITAL FOR EVENT 转喻类型,在汉语语料中则较少发现; 3) 句法位置会影响首都名转喻义的分布。当首都名处于主语位置时,首都名表达转喻义的几率显著增加;当其处于主语位置且句中谓词要求主语为有生名词时,首都名为转喻义的概率更高;当首都名处于非主语和非宾语位置时,则表达转喻义的可能性降低。4) 概念因素会影响首都名的转喻义用法。汉语使用者偏好使用本国首都做转喻义,排斥用他国首都名表达转喻含义;而英语使用者正相反,他们较为排斥本国首都的转喻义用法,偏好使用他国首都名来表达转喻意义; 5) 语篇因素也对首都名是否为转喻义产生显著影响。在体育类新闻中,首都名为转喻义的比例高于其他新闻主题。在汉语和英语中,句中若出现了同样表达转喻意义的地名,则首都名采用转喻义的概率显著提高。6) 随机森林判定语义韵在汉语和英语中都是影响首都名转喻义分布的显著变量,根据逻辑斯蒂回归分析,相对于中性的语义韵,语义韵为积极或消极时,首都名表达转喻义的概率显著增加。

总体而言,本研究将认知语言学的概念转喻理论与语料库技术结合,通过定

量分析发现，概念转喻在新闻语篇中的使用存在显著的跨语言差异，且受到句法位置因素、概念因素和语篇因素的影响。

关键词： 认知语言学；概念转喻；首都名；逻辑斯蒂回归模型；跨语言差异

Abstract

This study examines the (non)metonymic usage of capital names in Chinese and English news articles. Based on authentic linguistic data retrieved from both ‘Tagged Chinese Gigaword Corpus’ and ‘British National Corpus’, we try to identify the factors that may influence the (non)metonymic choice of the most frequent nine capital names in the corpora by using multivariate statistical analyses. Some data cleaning procedures were conducted to collect valid observations of capital name concordances. Then we randomly selected 3058 Chinese observations and 1947 English observations and annotated each observation with nine predictors from conceptual, syntactic and discursive aspects. To quantitatively explore the variations in the data, logistic regression analysis was employed to find out significant predictors and their interacting effects. We paid a special attention to the interactions between the predictor “language” (English vs. Chinese) and the other eight predictors. Finally, we employed random forests for Chinese and English data respectively to obtain the importance ranking of all the predictors in each language for the purpose of testing whether there is any cross-linguistic variation in this aspect.

The statistical results reveal that : 1) Metonymic usage of capital names is ubiquitous in many languages, especially for the metonymy pattern CAPITAL FOR GOVERNMENT, which is the most frequently used pattern in both Chinese and English. It has already become a conventional metonymy. 2) Metonymic usage of capital names shows great cross-linguistic variation. It is more commonly used in English and the pattern CAPITAL FOR EVENT is more favored in English than in Chinese. 3) From a syntactic perspective, metonymic capital names are more likely to be found in the subject and object positions, especially when the predicate in the sentence requires an animate subject. 4) Chinese people tend to use metonymic meaning of their own capital, *Beijing*, while *London* is underused in English as metonymic source. 5) Metonymic capital names are more favored in Sports news compared with others. And if there are metonymic place names in the same sentence, the probability of

metonymic usage of capital names significantly increases. 6) Semantic prosody is a significant predictor in the usage of (non)metonymic capital names in both Chinese and English data. Metonymic capital names appear more with positive or negative semantic prosody than the neutral one.

In conclusion, this study adopted empirical methodology by combining corpus techniques with conceptual metonymy theory in Cognitive Linguistics. It shows significant cross-linguistic variation of conceptual metonymy in news articles. And the metonymic usage of capital names is a result of an interplay of conceptual, syntactic and discursive factors.

Key words : Cognitive Linguistics; conceptual metonymy; capital names ; logistic regression; cross-linguistic variations