《英语双及物小句的认知研究》

图书基本信息

书名：《英语双及物小句的认知研究》

13位ISBN编号：9787510045745

10位ISBN编号：7510045746

出版时间：2012-5

出版社：世界图书出版公司

作者：田朝霞

页数：219

版权说明：本站所提供下载的PDF图书仅提供预览和简介以及在线试读，请支持正版图书。

更多资源请访问：www.tushu000.com

《英语双及物小句的认知研究》

内容概要

《英语双及物小句的认知研究》小句包含五个主要变体形式，分别以客体，即递送物的不同来标示，它们分别是具体物质、身份、信息、动作和事件。《英语双及物小句的认知研究》都有一个含“ 终属 ”的致使概念结构，但递送物的概念差异导致小句的概念语义变化，主要表现在概念角色的不同重合上。
《英语双及物小句的认知研究》从语言系统的认知操作可行性出发，旨在探讨小句在理解和产出过程中所激活的多维网络概念结构。英语双及物小句都包含一个含“ 终属 ”的致使概念结构，但递送物的概念差异导致小句的概念语义变化，主要表现在概念角色的不同重合上。《英语双及物小句的认知研究》以197个双及物动词的语料为主要依据，对这些差异作精细讨论。此外对双及物动词进行分类，并对以往研究中的一些特殊情况展开讨论。

《英语双及物小句的认知研究》

作者简介

田朝霞，陕西西安人。英语语言文学专业文学博士。现任南京师范大学外国语学院副教授、硕士生导师。研究方向主要为理论语言学及英语教学。发表论文十余篇，教材及译著多部。代表作有《形义匹配种种——四种构架语法模式的比较研究》、《英语双及物小句的五个主要变体——跨越“形义匹配”》、《英语口语语篇中的调核位置与信息焦点》等。

《英语双及物小句的认知研究》

书籍目录

Introduction
0.1 Aim and scope
0.1.1 The form of the ditraitive clause
0.1.2 The meaning of the ditraitive clause
0.1.3 The aim and the research pepective
0.2 Issues arising from previous analyses
0.3 Conceptual frame
0.4 The data
0.5 Layout of the dissertation
Chapter 1 Cognition and operation
1.1 Introduction
1.2 View of language
1.3 Cognition and operation
1.3.1 Cognition and language in cognitive science
1.3.2 Operation in cognitive linguistics
1.4 A stratified model
1.4.1 Neurocognitive linguistics
1.4.2 Tripartite parallel architecture
1.4.3 Conceptual frame
1.5 The syntactic structure of the ditraitive clause
1.6 Summary
Chapter 2 Conceptual frame
2.1 Introduction
2.2 Meaning activated in compreheion and production
2.2.1 Conceptual structure
2.2.2 Between the mental world and the outside world
2.2.3 The metaphorical account
2.2.4 Conceptual frame vs.argument structure
2.3 Cotrual operatio and conceptual frame
2.3.1 The ditraitive clause as a gestalt
2.3.3 Conceptual frame as a gestalt
2.4 Conclusion
Chapter 3 Major variants of the traferred object
3.1 Introduction
3.2 A radial network
3.2.1 The "prospective possessor" account and "affecte- dness" account
3.2.2 An overview of cotruction grammar
3.2.3 Discussion
3.2.4 Conceptual frame: A proposal
3.3 Major variants of the traferred object
3.3.1 A frequent type of the ditraitive clause
3.3.2 Object as Thing
3.3.3 Object as Identity
3.3.4 Object as Information
3.3.$ Object as Action
3.3.6 Object as Event

3.4 Discussion and conclusion
Chapter 4 Major variants and verb categorizatio
4.1 Introduction
4.1.1 Introduction
4.1.2 An investigation into the FrameNet
4.1.3 Semantic motivation and productivity
4.2 Trafer of Thing
4.2.1 Simple conceptual process
4.2.2 Simple conceptual process and the to-phrase
4.2.3 Composite conceptual process
4.2.4 The for-phrase and the to-phrase
4.2.5 From concrete things to abstract things
4.2.6 Summary
4.3 "Trafer" of Identity
4.4 Trafer of Information
4.4.1 Verbal Information
4.4.2 Non-verbal Information
4.5 "Trafer" of Action
4.5.1 Physical actio
4.5.2 Mental actio
4.6 Summary
Chapter 5 Special eases
5.1 Permit, allow ; forbid, prohibit
5.2 Owe
5.3 Buy
5.4 Previously recognized exceptio
5.4.1 Ask, beg; bill, charge, fine
5.4.2 Refuse and deny
5.4.3 Envy ; forgive ; bear ; mean
5.4.4 Save and spare
5.5 Metapho involving an abstract entity
5.6 Topics for future study
Conclusion
Appendix I A list of verbs that have been investigated
References

《英语双及物小句的认知研究》

章节摘录

In the analysis of John， baked Mary a cake， construction grammar and conceptual frame （CF） produces comparable results. Their similarities areas follows. First， the argument structure is equivalent to the causation structure; the verb frame is equivalent to the action structure in this case （though they are different in nature）. Second， in construction grammar the verb bake does not bear the sense of cause-receive; in the CF， Act does not conflate with Cause and Cause does not have a lexical realization. On this point， both construction grammar and the CF stand on the opposite side to lexical rules-construction denotes a particular conceptual structure of its own. Third， the form-meaning correspondence in construction gram- mar is comparable to form-meaning realization if not considering a differ-ence between grammatical relations and grammatical elements in this case. However， when it comes to John gave Mary a kiss， constructiongrammar， which takes it as a metaphorical extension， is not able to depict the whole picture.One argument structure "Cause-receive ，" which mainly focuses or ！causation， cannot capture the ac-tion structure of kissing. And this action structure is crucial to the actualcomprehension of the sentence. This is where the CF diverges from con- struction grammar-the action structure in the CF is defined in terms of theaction involved in the event， not in terms of the verb. The action denoted by John， gave Mary a kiss is kissin，g rather than givin，g in terms of what hap-pens in reality. This is why the argument structure in construction grammarcannot be adopted here： it is not a real conceptual structure， more similarto semantic structure. Levin （2004： 1） notes that， though differing inhow much meaning is allocated to the syntax and how much to the lexicon，construction grammar and lexical rules "incorporate the same important as-sumption about the nature of the meaning of sentences with verbs and theirarguments." ……

《英语双及物小句的认知研究》

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:www.tushu000.com