

語言與認知

戴浩一先生七秩壽慶論文集



張榮興 / 編輯

文鶴出版社

2011

語言與認知

戴浩一先生七秩壽慶論文集

LANGUAGE AND COGNITION:

FESTSCHRIFT IN HONOR OF

JAMES H-Y. TAI

ON HIS 70TH BIRTHDAY



張榮興

編輯

Edited by

Jung-hsing Chang



文鶴出版有限公司
CRANE PUBLISHING CO., LTD.

Language and Cognition: Festschrift in Honor of
James H-Y. Tai on His 70th Birthday

語言與認知：戴浩一先生七秩壽慶論文集

主 編：張榮興 (Jung-hsing Chang)

發行人：張富恭

印 刷：雅新彩藝有限公司

出版者：文鶴出版有限公司 地 址：106台北市金山南路二段200號8樓

電 話：(02) 2393-4497 傳 真：(02) 2394-3810

總公司：106台北市金山南路二段200號8樓

TEL: (02) 2393-4497 FAX: (02) 2394-6822 / 2394-3810

各區業務及門市

北 區：106台北市金山南路二段200號8樓

TEL: (02) 2393-4497 FAX: (02) 2394-6822 / 2394-3810

中 區：407台中市台中港路二段60-8號5樓之6

TEL: (04) 2317-0216 FAX: (04) 2314-0002

南 區：802 高雄市同慶路88號2樓

TEL: (07) 2270-888 FAX: (07) 2270-801

網路書店：<http://www.crane.com.tw>

網路書店客服信箱：crane.book@msa.hinet.net

法律顧問：蘇家宏律師

TEL: (02) 2365-1288

劃撥帳號：01079261

戶 名：文鶴出版有限公司

出版日期：2011年09月 初版一刷

定 價：700元

I S B N：978-986-147-491-5

書 號：003-1122

※著作權所有・翻印必究・非經本公司同意不得轉載、
仿製或局部使用於雜誌、網路或其他書籍、媒體上。

※若有缺頁，裝訂錯誤，煩請寄回更換。

封面圖片：艷紫荊(中正大學校花)

吳慧玲 繪



於中正大學研究室 (2011)



於中正大學文學院（2007）



在美國舊金山與六個孫子合照（2008）



獲得台灣語言學學會終身成就獎並發表感言（2010）

國立中正大學新聞稿 (2010-11-16)

國立中正大學講座教授兼人文與社會科學研究中心主任戴浩一，日前榮獲2010年台灣語言學學會所頒發的「終身成就獎」殊榮！該學會在頒獎典禮上表示，戴浩一教授不僅獲得台灣語言學界最高榮耀，更讚賞戴浩一教授為台灣語言學界的「領航者」代表，不但開創新的研究路線及方向，更啟發了後進學者的研究思潮。

榮獲此獎項的戴浩一教授，以「一個求學求知的旅程：由鹿港小鎮到陳厝寮」為主題，於年會上介紹其求學及學術研究的心路歷程，獲得與會學者的讚賞與尊崇。戴教授表示，雖然獲得「終身成就獎」的肯定，但仍將秉持勤奮不懈的態度，在學術領域上繼續鑽研。

頒獎典禮上，台灣語言學學會特別以中正大學文學院蔡素娟院長所題詞的字句：「浩然氣概廣納百家闢蹊徑，一以貫之深淺莊諧唯本心」雋刻於獎盃上，並由上屆獲終身成就獎的黃宣範博士頒發此獎。台灣語言學學會其宗旨在於推動台灣之語言學專業研究與教育，促進國內外語言學的交流。

戴浩一教授於1995年自美返台至中正大學任教，創立該校語言學研究所，曾任中正大學文學院院長、副校長，並曾借調至國科會擔任人文處處長。戴浩一教授並於今年開始進行「老化與語言&認知」的研究，希望藉由語言學的角度，協助醫學上對於各種老化相關疾病，如失智症的早期診斷與治療。

序

戴浩一教授的祝壽論文集即將出版。回顧戴浩一教授數十年來對於語言學的教學和研究，最讓我印象深刻的是他對語言學研究的熱忱始終不減。戴老師於1970年獲得美國印地安那大學（Indiana University）語言學博士學位後，曾任教於美國南伊利諾大學（Southern Illinois University）外國語文學系，以及美國俄亥俄州立大學（Ohio State University）東方語文學系。1995年受邀回台灣，成立了國立中正大學語言學研究所，並擔任第一任及第二任所長，積極推動語言與認知的研究，並結合心理系和哲學系組成國內一個非常活躍、有潛力的認知科學研究群，提升了語言學在人文科學所扮演的角色和地位。他在語言學上的貢獻和付出獲得語言學界一致的認同與肯定，並於2010年獲台灣語言學學會所頒發之「終身成就獎」。

戴老師從創立中正大學語言所以來，即以「語言與認知」為發展的重點與方向，除了在漢語認知語言學上有巨大的貢獻以及深遠的影響之外，近十年來更是積極推動台灣手語的研究。在手語常被誤解成只是一種手勢，不被視為是一種自然語言的環境下，戴老師除了導正一般人對手語的錯誤認知之外，並積極推展台灣手語的研究。其多年來的努力，除了開拓了台灣語言學研究的視野之外，也將語言學的研究擴展到對弱勢族群的關懷，讓更多人了解到手語研究的重要與意義。

本論文集之所以以《語言與認知：戴浩一先生七秩壽慶論文集》為標題，主要目的是希望能凸顯戴老師在「語言與認知」方面的成就和貢獻。在論文集的內容方面，主要分成認知語言學、手語語言學、以及漢語、閩南語及南島語語言學等三部分，這三部分正好也反映了戴教授多年來對這些領域的關懷和奮鬥。本論文集邀稿的對象主要以國內學者為主，另外一冊主要包含國外學者文章，正由俄亥俄州立大學陳潔雯（Marjorie K. M. Chan）教授負責籌劃和編輯。

本論文集從2010年7月邀稿至2011年8月編輯完成，歷經一年多的時間，在這段時間中，每篇文章都經過審查及修改的過程，非常感謝每位作者在整個過程中的配合，並感謝擔任本論文集之審查委員。

張榮興

中正大學語言所

2011年9月6日

Table of Contents

目 錄

I . Cognitive Linguistics / 認知語言學

A Prototype-Based Approach to IDEA Metaphors in Mandarin Chinese

Shu-Ping Gong (龔書萍).....1

Types of Classifiers and an Incipient Count/Mass Noun Distinction

Shuanfan Huang (黃宣範).....21

Mental Space Theory and Referential Ambiguity in Chinese Narrative

Hui-hua Hwang (黃惠華).....45

A Cognition-based Semantic Analysis of English Classifiers

Jenny Yichun Kuo (郭怡君).....65

From Subjectification to Intersubjectification: A Cognitive-pragmatic Analysis of Hedging Expression

Lily I-Wen Su (蘇以文) and Kai-Yuan Cheng (鄭凱元)85

在可數與不可數名詞之外

鄧育仁 (Norman Y. Teng)、孫式文 (Sewen Sun).....103

II . Sign Linguistics / 手語語言學

Mouth Actions in Taiwan Sign Language

Yijun Chen (陳怡君)113

Numeral Incorporation in Taiwan Sign Language

Susan Fischer, Yu Hung (洪瑜), and Shih-Kai Liu (劉世凱)147

Representation Efficiency and Transmission Efficiency in Sign and Speech	
James Myers (麥傑), Jane Tsay (蔡素娟), and Shiou-fen Su (蘇秀芬)	171
Manner-salience revisited: Investigating Mandarin Chinese and Taiwan Sign Language	
Shiou-fen Su (蘇秀芬)	201
台灣手語的比較句結構	
林建宏 (Chien-hung Lin)	235
台灣手語人名之造詞研究	
張榮興 (Jung-hsing Chang)、莊琮羽 (Tsung-Yu Chuang)	259
III. Mandarin, Minnan and Formosa Linguistics /	
漢語、閩南語及南島語語言學	
Transitivity, Ergativity, and the Status of O in Tsou	
Henry Y. Chang (張永利)	277
The Syllable in Minnan: Making Sense of Conflicting Sources of Evidence	
Bruce L. Derwing, H. Samuel Wang (王旭), and Jane Tsay (蔡素娟)	309
Chinese Durative and Completive NPs as Polarity Items	
Jo-wang Lin (林若望)	345
Semantic Features of Counting Units in a Syntagmatic Perspective	
Niina Ning Zhang (張寧)	363
再論語意中的橋接現象	
吳俊雄 (Jiun-Shiung Wu)	395
第三人稱單數代名詞在口語中的進一步語法化	
畢永峨 (Yung-O Biq)、黃怡嘉 (Kristan Huang)	417

閩南語微量詞構式探索	
連金發 (Chinfa Lien).....	435
從福州、南昌、閩南方言的比較看漢語音韻中的兩種喉塞韻尾	
曹逢甫 (Feng-fu Tsao)、石曉婷 (Hsiao-ping Shih).....	449

A Prototype-Based Approach to IDEA Metaphors in Mandarin Chinese

Shu-Ping Gong

National Chiayi University

This study aims to examine which of the three metaphor theory models—the Attributive Categorization Model, the Structure Mapping Model, and the Conceptual Mapping Model—can predict the distribution of conceptual metaphors found in the corpus data. In this study, we selected the IDEA metaphors in Mandarin Chinese to explore this issue. It has been hypothesized that the Conceptual Mapping Model (Ahrens 2002, 2010) can appropriately predict the corpus data for the IDEA metaphors. We examined IDEA metaphors in Mandarin Chinese and categorized them into two classes: metaphors involving prototypical mappings and those involving non-prototypical mappings. In addition, we used Chinese Word Sketch and Academia Sinica Bilingual Ontological WordNet to determine the IDEA metaphors in Mandarin Chinese. We expected that metaphors involving prototypical mappings would occur more frequently than those involving non-prototypical mappings. The results demonstrated that the frequency of metaphors involving prototypical mappings was higher than those involving non-prototypical mappings. Furthermore, the corpus data showed that a target domain selected different source domains for distinct reasons. For example, the target domain of IDEA selected the source domain of BUILDING relating to the notion of structure, while it selected COMMODITY relating to the notion of promotion. This study supports the Conceptual Mapping Model and has theoretical implications in research methods and mapping analyses for studying conceptual metaphors.

Key Words: Underlying reasons, Conceptual Mapping Model, collocational frequency, prototypical mappings, Mandarin Chinese

1. INTRODUCTION

The question of how metaphors are processed and interpreted has been examined intensively in recent decades (Gibbs 1994; Grady 1997; Lakoff 1993; Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Ritchie 2006). In particular, there are three metaphor models that have been proposed: the Attributive Categorization Model (Glucksberg et al. 1997; Keysar et al. 2000; McGlone 1996, 2007), the Structure Mapping Model (Bowdle & Gentner 2005; Gentner & Wolff 1997), and the Conceptual Mapping Model, (Ahrens 2002, 2010; Gong et al. 2008; Gong 2009).

The *Attributive Categorization Model* (Glucksberg et al. 1997; Keysar et al. 2000; McGlone 1996, 2007) has proposed that metaphor processing involves dual references in which there is no direct link between source and target domains. Instead, when participants process metaphors, for example, the metaphor “Our marriage is a rollercoaster ride”, a metaphorical category of “exciting and scary situation” will be

created from the source domain of “a rollercoaster ride”, and this superordinate category will be projected to the target domain of “our marriage”. Only the most salient and typical properties from the source domains will be accessed as a superordinate category. In addition, the Attributive Categorization Model suggests that since the superordinate category is created only during the course of processing, there should be no pre-existing mappings between source and target domains.

Glucksberg et al.’s (1997) experiments support the Attributive Categorization Model. They examined two types of “X IS Y” metaphors in English: one type was metaphors using ambiguous source domains (e.g., “Some offices are icebergs”) and the other was metaphors using unambiguous source domains (e.g., “Some jobs are prisons”). They predicted that metaphors using unambiguous source domains would be processed faster than those using ambiguous source domains, since the former involves typical properties in unambiguous source domains, and participants could easily generate a superordinate category during metaphor processing, while the latter involves less salient properties in ambiguous source domains, and participants needed time and effort to create a possible superordinate category for understanding metaphors. The results of their experiments demonstrated that metaphors using ambiguous source domains took longer to read than the unambiguous source domains, which suggests that metaphors are understood via the category-based mechanism.

On the other hand, the *Structure Mapping Model* (Bowdle & Gentner 2005; Gentner & Wolff 1997) has proposed that interpreting metaphors involves two stages—alignment and projection. The alignment process requires that the elements between two domains be aligned one-to-one before these one-to-one correspondences can be connected. Thereafter, emergent features from the source domains will be projected to the target as candidate inference. For example, when participants process the phrase “Men are wolves,” the first step is to align elements of the source domain “wolves” to “men”, such as “wolves” aligned to “men”, and “animals” aligned to “women”, and “prey on” in the source domain aligned to “prey on” in the target domain. After each element in the source domain of “wolves” is aligned to the concept in the target domain of “men”, a parallel connectivity is established between domains. Finally, a unique meaning from the source domain is projected to “men”, which is used to interpret the meaning that “Men are like wolves by instinct to prey on women.”

Gentner & Wolff’s (1997) reading time studies support the Structure Mapping Model. They instructed participants to read metaphors either primed by target domains (e.g., “A job is a _____”) or by source domains (e.g., “A _____ is a jail”), and their reading times were measured. They expected that metaphors would be understood by aligning every mapping from source domains to target domains and

predicted that there would be no difference in reading time between the two types of metaphors. Their results showed that metaphors primed by source domains were read as fast as those primed by target domains, which is consistent with the predictions of the Structure Mapping Model.

The *Conceptual Mapping Model* (Ahrens 2002, 2010) has proposed that there is an underlying reason (i.e., a prototypical mapping) occurring in source-target domain pairing. This prototypical mapping is called a *Mapping Principle* (MP). The mapping principle could be generated based on the salient meanings from a cluster of metaphorical expressions that share a similar conceptual mapping via linguistic analysis. For example, the lexical items of the source domain of BUILDING, including 架構 *jiàgòu* “frame”, 鬆散 *sōngsǎn* “loose”, and 根基 *gēnjī* “base”, are frequently used to characterize the target domain of IDEA. Indeed, the BUILDING lexical items used for the IDEA domain can be analyzed as relating to a structure of a building, and thus the underlying reason, or MP, of AN IDEA IS A BUILDING postulated is: *an idea is understood as a building because a building involves a (physical) structure and ideas involve (abstract) organization*.

In addition, this Conceptual Mapping Model proposes that one target domain does not select two different source domains for the same underlying reasons. For instance, Ahrens (2002, 2010) found that when the target domain of IDEA is discussed metaphorically in terms of the two source domains of INFANT and COMMODITY, the similar notions of “creation” and “production” are formed. The source domain of COMMODITY, however, relates to the notion of “marketing”, while the source domain of INFANT relates to the notion of “the birthing process”. Therefore, this Conceptual Mapping Model provides a more sophisticated mapping principle to restrict different source domains that are mapped to the same target domain for distinct mapping principles. This is called a *Mapping Principle Constraint* (Ahrens 2002, 2010).

Ahrens’ (2002, 2010) reading time experiments and Gong’s (2009) production experiments support the Conceptual Mapping Model. Ahrens (2002, 2010) examined different types of conceptual metaphors in Mandarin Chinese: conventional metaphors, novel metaphors following mapping principles, and novel metaphors not following mapping principles. Participants were instructed to read each type of metaphor sentence and reading times were measured. Ahrens expected that mapping principles would be used in the processing of metaphors and predicted that conventional metaphors would be read faster than the two types of novel metaphors. In addition, novel metaphors following mapping principles would be read faster than those not following mapping principles. The results confirmed Ahrens’ hypothesis, which supports the Conceptual Mapping Model.

Furthermore, in Gong's (2009) production task, participants were instructed to read "X IS Y" metaphors in Mandarin Chinese and paraphrase their meanings. The first paraphrase for each metaphor was analyzed. Gong expected that the paraphrases relating to their corresponding mapping principles would occur more frequently than the paraphrases not relating to the mapping principles. The production results showed that the tokens of MP-related paraphrases were significantly higher than the tokens of MP-unrelated paraphrases. Both Ahrens' (2002, 2010) and Gong's (2009) behavior studies demonstrated that participants used mapping principles to process conceptual metaphors.

Previous psycholinguistic studies have shown evidence supporting the three metaphor approaches or models (Bortfeld & McGlone 2001; Gibbs 1994; Gong & Ahrens 2007). In addition, past research used the quantitative or corpus approach to identify metaphors (Deignan 1999; Deignan & Potter 2004; Hsieh 2009; Huang et al. 2006; Semino 2005; Steen 1997; Stefanowitsch 2005), examining metaphoric coherence in discourse (Gong 2011), determining target or source domains (Chung 2009), and determining mapping principles for conceptual metaphors in Mandarin Chinese (Ahrens et al. 2003, 2004; Gong et al. 2008). However, little research uses a quantitative approach to analyze metaphor frequency in corpora from the prototype perspective in order to evaluate the three metaphor models. Indeed, all three models discuss how mappings are connected from the source domains to the target domains, but the three models posit different predictions on which mappings will be selected by the target domains. To be more specific, the Attributive Categorization Model suggests that only prototypical concepts from source domains are mapped to target domains. The Structure Mapping Model suggests that all concepts from source domains (including prototypical or peripheral ones) are mapped to target domains. Finally, the Conceptual Mapping Model suggests that both prototypical and peripheral concepts are mapped to target domains. However, there will be an asymmetric frequency between prototypical mappings and peripheral mappings. So far, no studies have tested the three metaphor models via using the quantitative data of metaphors found in corpora. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a study to determine which metaphor model is more appropriate in predicting the distribution of metaphors involving prototypical mappings and non-prototypical mappings.

In this study, we selected the IDEA metaphors in Mandarin Chinese to evaluate the three metaphor models. Two corpora, Chinese Word Sketch and Academia Sinica Bilingual Ontology WordNet, were used to determine the metaphorical expressions using the target domain of IDEA. In order to evaluate the three metaphor models, the extracted metaphors were categorized into two classes of mappings from the prototype perspective: prototypical mappings and non-prototypical mappings.

The Attributive Categorization Model predicts that only prototypical mappings will be found in corpora, and that non-prototypical mappings will not occur since only the salient properties of the superordinate category will be used in the processing of metaphors. Thus, the Attributive Categorization Model predicts that 100 percent of the data found in corpora will be prototypical mappings.

On the other hand, the Structure Mapping Model predicts that the prototypical mappings and non-prototypical mappings should be balanced in frequency, since both relevant and irrelevant mappings will be aligned and projected from source domains to target domains during metaphor processing. Thus, the Structure Mapping Model predicts that there should be *no difference* in frequency between the metaphors involving prototypical mappings and those involving non-prototypical mappings.

Finally, the Conceptual Mapping Model predicts that the metaphors involving prototypical mappings will occur more frequently in corpora than those involving non-prototypical mappings. According to this model, people produce or comprehend metaphors via processing mapping principles but the mapping principles are not automatically accessed. Therefore, metaphors that are not related to mapping principles are also produced in daily conversation, but they do not occur very often because they are not prototypes. Thus, the Conceptual Mapping Model expects that the frequency of metaphors involving prototypical mappings will be *higher* than those involving non-prototypical mappings.

2. CORPORA

In this section, we will introduce the corpora we used for this research: Chinese Word Sketch and Academia Sinica Bilingual Ontological WordNet.

2.1 Chinese Word Sketch

The first corpus we used in this study was Chinese Word Sketch (http://corpora.fi.muni.cz/chinese_all/), a corpus processing system that was developed in 2005 (Huang et al. 2005). It was constructed by loading the Gigaword Corpus into the Sketch Engine (Kilgarrieff et al. 2005). The Gigaword Corpus contains about 1.12 billion Chinese characters, including 735 million characters from Taiwan's Central News Agency and 380 million characters from China's Xinhua News Agency. Components of the Sketch Engine are found in Chinese Word Sketch, including Concordances, Word Sketch, Thesaurus, and Sketch Difference.

Chinese Word Sketch can provide collocational information based on a large-scale corpus. It offers researchers information about a keyword's functional

distribution and the collocations in the corpus. The functional distribution includes subject, object, prepositional object, and modifier. The collocations provide information on how frequently a keyword occurs with a particular word.

Chinese Word Sketch also produces a thesaurus list for adjectives, nouns, or verbs (Kilgarrieff et al. 2005). The synonym items are automatically extracted based on common patterns of syntactic structures. This function is able to demonstrate a cluster of lexical words that have similar meanings but are different in linguistic forms. For example, Table 1 shows twelve synonyms produced by the Thesaurus for the lexical item 想法 *xiǎngfǎ* “idea”.

Table 1: Synonymous Words for 想法 *xiǎngfǎ* “idea”

Target words	Candidate synonyms	
想法 <i>xiǎngfǎ</i> “idea”	看法 <i>kànfǎ</i> “opinions”	觀念 <i>guānniàn</i> “concept”
	觀點 <i>guāndiǎn</i> “opinions”	意見 <i>yìjiàn</i> “opinion”
	構想 <i>gòuxiǎng</i> “idea”	態度 <i>tàidu</i> “attitude”
	理念 <i>lǐniàn</i> “idea”	立場 <i>lìchǎng</i> “a position”
	訴求 <i>sù qiú</i> “request”	型態 <i>xíngtài</i> “form”
	角度 <i>jiǎodù</i> “a point of view”	背景 <i>bèijǐng</i> “background”

2.2 Academia Sinica Bilingual Ontological WordNet

The second corpus we used was Academia Sinica Bilingual Ontological WordNet, a Chinese-English bilingual translation equivalent database (<http://ckip.iis.sinica.edu.tw/CKIP/ontology/>) that has been in development by Academia Sinica since 2002. This corpus integrates WordNet with the Suggested Upper Merged Ontology (SUMO) and allows users to search and map English or Chinese lexical meanings as defined in WordNet with a concept node on the SUMO ontology. WordNet (<http://wordnet.princeton.edu/>) is an online lexical database of English. Different grammatical categories of the same lemma are grouped into sets of synsets. Thus, a keyword in this corpus is interlinked in terms of conceptual-semantic and lexical relations.

In addition, SUMO (<http://ontology.teknowledge.com/>) is a shared upper ontology developed by the IEEE Standard Upper Ontology Working Group. Similar to a dictionary or a glossary, it includes higher-level concepts and an associated structure that enables computers to process its content. It consists of a set of general concepts, relations, and axioms and formalizes the description of the structures of the knowledge domains. The upper ontology allows users to identify a concept either in