A Contrastive Study on Semantic Prosody of English and Chinese Logical Resultative Formulae

Meixia Li, Aihui Jiao

Beijing International Studies University, China

0371

The European Conference on Education 2013

Official Conference Proceedings 2013

Abstract

This article aims to make a contrastive study on semantic prosody of English and Chinese logical resultative formulae. In previous studies, based on corpus, we found that English has 13 most frequently-used logical resultative formulae and Chinese has 15, and in addition, both English and Chinese logical resultative formulae possess negative, neutral and mixed semantic prosody. In spite of this, both English and Chinese logical resultative formulae share something in common and diverge even when they express the same semantic prosody. Therefore, in order to reveal similarities and differences between English and Chinese, a corpus-based approach and a contrastive analysis approach are employed, and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and the corpus established by the Center for Chinese Linguistics PKU (shortened as CCL) are chosen. Afterwards, a contrastive study is conducted from the four dimensions: quantity, collocates, semantic preferences and evaluative polarity. The study discovers that in English and Chinese, nine of the top ten most frequently-used formulae possess mixed or neutral semantic prosody and additionally, either English-speaking or Chinese-speaking people more frequently explain causes or effects with formulae that bear neutral or mixed semantic prosody. Differences are great in collocates, semantic preferences and evaluative polarity. This study reminds us that while teaching or learning English and Chinese logical resultative formulae, we should try to be aware of such differences in semantic prosody so as to avoid semantic clash in the context.

Key Words: semantic prosody, logical resultative formulae, contrastive study, corpus-based

INTRODUCTION

Logical resultative formulae refer to the formulaic language that expresses logical resultative relationship between two situations or events. (Li & Jiao 2012） In the previous two articles (Li and Jiao 2012, 2013), based on corpus, we discovered that in English, there are 13 most frequently-used logical resultative formulae, while in Chinese, there are 15. The 13 English logical resultative formulae are: *caused by, so that, now that, as a result, so...that, because of, due to, [result] in, as a result of, [lead] to, [result] from, thanks to, [bring] about*; and the 15 Chinese logical resultative formulae are: *yinci /(因此/thus), suoyi(所以/so), yushi/(于是/ then), jiran/ (既然/since), yinwei /（因为/because）, yinwei...suoyi/because…so(因为…所以/ because… so), jiran...jiu /since… then(既然…就/since… then) , youyu...yinci/ since… thus(由于…因此/ since… thus), youyu…suoyi /owing to... so(由于…所以/because…so), yuanyin shi / The reason is…, 原因是/The reason…), yin'er /thus(因而/thus), zhisuoyi...shiyinwei /What it is is because …(之所以…是因为/What it is is because…), youyu /owing to(由于/since) , daozhile/(导致了/lead to) , zaochengle /(造成了/ result in).* In discourse, be they English or Chinese logical resultative formulae, they often show various semantic tendencies, i.e, they can attract collocates of the same or different semantic features, which habitually transmits not only conceptual meaning but also interpersonal meaning, namely the addresser's attitudinal meaning, also called semantic prosody in corpus linguistics. The term "semantic prosody" comes from Firth's "phonological prosody". In 1987, based upon Firth's notion, Sinclair coined this term. But until 1993 it was Louv who first made this term known to the public. Later on, this term was widely used by scholars such as Sinclair (1991, p. 112), Louv (1993, pp. 157-176), Stubbs (1995, 2001), Partington (1998, 2004), Tribble (2000, pp.74-90), Whitsitt (2005, pp. 283-305), Hunston (2007, pp. 249-268), Stewart (2010, p.1), etc. Now this term has become one of the most important notions in corpus linguistics. (Whitsitt 2005: pp. 283-305) As for its definition, different scholars conceptualize it in different ways. Roughly speaking, semantic prosody refers to the attitudinal meaning formed through habitual usage of a word or a class of words, which may be positive or negative or neutral or even mixed.

Thus it can be deduced that since they frequently co-occur with a certain words, which have the same or similar semantic features, these English /Chinese logical resultative formulae have semantic prosody. In the previous survey (Li and Jiao 2012, 2013), it has been found that in English, *as a result of, caused by, [lead] to* tend to express negative semantic prosody, *so that, now that, as a result, [result] from and thanks to* neutral semantic prosody and *so … that, [bring] about, because of, [result] in* and *due to* mixed semantic prosody, while in Chinese, *daozhile (导致了/lead to), zaocheng le (造成了/result in)* tend to express negative (^neutral) semantic prosody, *yinwei...suoyi... (因为...所以.../because… so), suoyi (所以/so), yinci (因此/therefore), yushi(于是/ therefore), yin'er (因而/thus), jiran (既然/since), yinwei...suoyi... (因为...所以.../because… so), jiran...jiu... (既然…就.../since… then), youyu...yinci... (由于…因此.../owing to… therefore),*

youyu...suoyi... (由于...所以.../owing to… so), zhisuoyi...shiyinwei... (之所以...是因为.../ What it is is because…) neutral semantic prosody and *yuanyin shi (原因是/The reason is…)* and *youyu* (由于/ owing to) mixed semantic prosody.

Then what are the similarities and differences between English and Chinese? Has this topic been studied? Up to now, scholars at home and abroad (Peterson & McCabe, 1985; Xu & Li, 2005; Liao, 2007) have studied resultatives in English or Chinese respectively and some contrastive studies related with syntactic and semantic similarities and differences of these expressions have been conducted. But none of these studies have paid attention to the similarities and differences of semantic prosody that English and Chinese logical resultative formulae carry. Therefore, this study will attempt to conduct a systematic contrastive study from four dimensions: quantity, collocates, semantic preferences and evaluative polarity

METHODOLOGY

Method Adopted

Quantitative Contrastive Study Method This method is the quantitative analysis study in the empirical research. The Chinese scholar Xu Yulong (2002), based on the characteristics of linguistic contrastive study, partitions empirical research into three categories: quantitative discourse contrastive analysis study, linguistic contrastive survey study and experimental study, among which quantitative discourse contrastive analysis study refers to the contrastive study of the distribution and the usage of two corresponding language systems and items. In this study discourse contrastive analysis study method is employed.

Data Sources

First, this study selects both English and Chinese data respectively from the contemporary text. The English data comes from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (shortened as COCA), which are roughly distributed evenly into five genres: spoken, fiction, popular magazine, newspapers, academic journals. The Chinese data is from the corpus established by the Center for Chinese Linguistics PKU (shortened as CCL). CCL consists of modern Chinese corpus and ancient Chinese corpus. The modern Chinese corpus, composed of such genres as oral talking, newspaper, journals, literature, TV programs, radio, films, translated works and academic papers, is used in this study.

A CONTRASTIVE STUDY ON SEMANTIC PROSODY OF ENGLISG AND CHINESE LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE

From the Dimension of Quantity

In English, three logical resultative formulae *as a result of, caused by* and *[lead] to* has a tendency to express negative semantic prosody while in Chinese, two logical resultative formulae *daozhile (导致了/lead to)* and *zaochengle (造成了/ result in)* has the same tendency. In addition, in English, five logical resultative formulae such as *so that, now that, as a result, [result] from* and *thanks to* tend to express neutral semantic prosody, while in Chinese, eleven ones including *yinwei...suoyi... (因为…所以.../because… so), suoyi (所以/so), yinci (因此/ therefore), yushi(于是/therefore), yin'er (因而/ thus), jiran (既然/since), yinwei...suoyi... (因为...所以.../, because… so), jiran...jiu... (既然...就.../ since… then), youyu...yinci... (由于...因此.../owing to… therefore), youyu...suoyi... (由于...所以.../ owing to… so), zhisuoyi...shiyinwei... (之所以...是因为.../What it is is because…)* tend to express neutral semantic prosody. Finally, in English, there are also five logical resultative formulae including *so…that, [bring] about, because of, [result] in, due to* which are likely to convey mixed semantic prosody, whilst in Chinese, there are only two, i.e. *yunyin shi (原因是/ The reason is…)* and *youyu (由于/ owing to)* which fulfill the same function.

Apart from the differences in the number of logical resultative formulae, both English-speaking people and Chinese-speaking people share some similarities in using these formulae, for example, in expressing logical resultative relations, both of them incline to frequently use top ten formulae; in English they are *because of, so that, lead to, result in, due to, now that, so… that, thanks to, as a result of, as a result*; in Chinese they are *yinwei（因为/because）, youyu(由于/since), yinci (因此/thus), suoyi (所以/so), yushi(于是/ then), yin'er (因而/thus) , jiran(既然/since), yinwei…suo(因为...所以/ because… so), yuanyin shi(原因是/The reason…), jiran…jiu(既然…就/since… then)*. And it can also be found that both English and Chinese-speaking people frequently explain causes and effects with logical resultative formulae bearing neutral or mixed semantic prosody.

From the Dimension of Collocates, Semantic Preferences and Evaluative Polarity

CONTRAST BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CHINESE LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE EXPRESSING NEGATIVE SEMANTIC PROSODY

From the Dimension of Collocates and Semantic Preferences

Collocates refer to the words that co-occur with logical resultative formulae. Semantic preferences, based on the research made by Stubbs (2001, p. 65), Partington (1998, 2004), etc, can be defined as such: When a word frequently collocates with a group of words or several groups of words having the similar meaning, which presents fixed grammatical structures, semantic preferences occur.

TABLE 1 LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE EXPRESSING NEGATIVE SEMANTIC PROSODY

ELFR	**Semantic Preferences**	**Collocates**
As a result of	Disaster	War, invasion, massacres, etc
	Disease	Infection, heatstroke, surgery, etc.
	Tragedy	Pressure, wrongdoings, drought, etc.
Caused by	Disease	Suffering, disease, viruses, etc.
	Accident	Collision, accidents, explosion, etc.
	Nervousness	Stress, fear, pressure, etc.
Lead to	Unfortunateness	Tragedy, failure, risk, outbreaks, troubles, etc.
	Harm	Disease, deaths, injury, murder, etc.
	Bad feeling	Despair, tension, rampage, etc
	Corruption	Corruption, etc
CLFR	**Semantic Preferences**	**Collocates**
Daozhi le(导致了/lead to)	Abstract undesirability	Shibai(失败/failure), jieguo (结果/result), chansheng (产生/produce), beiju (悲剧/tradegy), xiajiang (下降/decrease), bianhua (变化/change), wenti (问题/question), weiji (危机/crisis), houguo (后果/outcome), etc.
Zaochengle (造成了/result in)	Concrete misfortune or damage	Sunshi (损失/loss)/, yingxiang(影响/impact), kunnan (困难/diffculty), hunluan (混乱/chaos), sunhai (损害/damage),yali (压力/pressure), pohuai (破坏/destruction), wuran (污染/pollution), weihai (危害/harm), shangwang (伤亡/casuality), etc.

From Table 1, it can be seen that although three English logical resultative formulae and two Chinese logical resultative formulae are similar in expressing semantic prosody, their collocates and semantic preferences are different. *As a result of* often collocates with such words as *war, invasion, massacres, infection, heatstroke, surgery, pressure, wrongdoings, drought,* etc., which can be roughly divided into three types of semantic preferences: disaster, disease, tragedy, etc. *Caused by* always co-occurs with these words: *suffering, disease, viruses, collisions, accidents, explosion, stress, fear, pressure,* etc., which belongs to three types of semantic preferences: disease, accident, nervousness, etc. *[Lead] to* is likely go together with the following collocates: *tragedy, failure, risk, outbreaks, troubles, disease, death, injury, murder, despair, tension, rampage, corruption*, etc., which might be grouped into the following four sorts of semantic preferences: unfortunateness, harm, bad feeling, corruption, etc. *Daozhile (导致了/lead to)* is often followed by *shibai(失败/failure), jieguo (结果/result), chansheng (产生/produce), beiju (悲剧/tradegy), xiajiang (下降/decrease), bianhua (变化/change), wenti (问题/ question), weiji (危机/crisis), houguo (后果/outcome)*, etc.. These words can be said to express a kind of transformation, which is undesirable and abstract. So their semantic preferences are undesirable general transformation. But after *zaochengle (造成了/result in)*, the following words can be frequently seen: *suishi (损失/loss), yingxiang (影响/impact), kunnan (困难/difficulty), hunlun (混乱/chaos), sunhai (损害/damage), yali(压力/pressure), pohuai (破坏/destruction), wuran (污染/pollution), weihai (危害/harm), shangwang (伤亡/casuality)*, etc.. These words express the semantic preference of concrete misfortune or damage.

From the Dimension of Evaluative Polarity

TABLE 2 DISTRIBUTION OF EVALUATIVE POLARITY OF ENGLISH AND CHINESES LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE

		Positive	Neutral	Negative
ELFR	As a result of	10.87%	34.87%	54.35%
	Caused by	4.69%	37.50%	57.81%
	Lead to	16.67%	33.33%	50%
CLRF	Daozhile (导致了/lead to)	2.08%	8.33%	85.99%
	Zaochengle (造成了/result in)	0%	20%	80%

Table 2 reveals the sharp contrast between three English logical resultative formulae and two Chinese logical resultative formulae in terms of the distribution ration of the positive, the neutral and the negative evaluative polarity. Generally speaking, the differences of the distribution ration of the positive, the neutral and the negative evaluative polarity of the three English logical resultative formulae is not as big as that of the two Chinese logical resultative formulae. It is obvious that the evaluative polarity pattern for three English logical resultative formulae is: negative ^ neutral ^ (occasionally) positive while the dominant evaluative polarity for two Chinese logical resultative formulae is: negative and occasionally neutral; for *zaocheng le (造成了/result in)*, there is no positive semantic prosody and for *daozhi le (导致了/lead to)*, there is a slim chance to have positive semantic prosody.

Thus, from the above analysis, it can be stated that, first, three English logical resultative formulae carry various delicate kinds of negative attitudinal meaning, which concerns with the consequences ranging from the most serious ones to the less serious and the least serious ones. For two Chinese logical resultative formulae, the attitudinal meaning is holistically expressed, and the words concerned express the general undesirability. The differences presented here may be due to each nation's character. English-speaking people may like to express their attitudes directly and openly while Chinese-speaking people prefer to express their attitudinal meaning implicitly and ambiguously. This feature also exhibits itself on the usage of logical resultative formulae.

CONTRAST BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CHINESE LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULE EXPRESSING NEUTRAL SEMANTIC PROSODY

From the Dimension of Collocates and Semantic Preferences

TABLE 3 LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE EXPRESSING NEUTRAL SEMANTIC PROSODY

ELFR	**Semantic Preferences**	**Collocates**
Result from		study, studies, changes, exposure, experiment, (pollution, loss), etc.
Thanks to		audience, panel, subsidy, work, influence, sometimes (vigilance, deregulation), etc.
So that		+ Clauses beginning with the following words: They, It, We, Students, Children, etc.
Now that		
As a result		
CLFR	**Semantic Preferences**	**Collocates**
Yinci (因此/thus)	(1) referential meaning (2) transformation, impacts, insufficiency, etc. (3) cognition and affection (4) processes of saying (doing, existence, etc.) (5) the beginning and the result of an event or an action	zhege/这个，zhezhong/这种， gongsi /公司, etc.
Suoyi (所以/so)		fazhan/ 发展， bianhua/ 变化， yingxiang/ 影响， xianzhi/限制, jinzhang/紧张, queshao/缺少, etc.
Yushi (于是/then)		zhidao/知道, renshi/认识, liaojie/了解, xihuan/喜欢, haipa /害怕, xuyao/需要
Yin'er (因而/therefore)		tichu/提出, tongguo/通过/, caiqu/采取, jianyi /建议, etc.
Jiran (既然/since)		kaishi/ 开始， chuxian/ 出现， huidao/ 回到， chanshengle/产生了, etc.
Yinwei (因为/because)		
Yinwei…Suoyi (因为…所以/because…so)		
Jiran…jiu (既然…就)/since…then)		
Youyu…yinci…(由于…因此/ Owing to…therefore)		
Youyu…Suoyi(由于…所以…owing to…so)		
Zhisuoyi…Shiyinwei…(之所以…是因为…/What it is is because…)		

These logical resultative formulae shown in Table 3 can be classified into the domain of neutral semantic prosody, that is to say, they can collocate with any nominal words or even clauses beginning with nominal pronouns or nominal phrases without biased attitudinal evaluation. In English, five logical resultative formulae are of this feature and in Chinese, there are eleven which possess this feature. The semantic preferences of the collocates of these logical resultative formulae can be generally grouped into five types: (1) referential meaning, namely, these words can denote an entity existing in the reality; (2) transformations, impact, insufficiency, etc.; (3) the meaning of cognition and affection; (4) processes of saying, doing and existing; (5) the beginning and the result of an event or an action, etc.

The above-mentioned is what the five English logical resultative formulae and eleven Chinese logical resultative formulae have in common. The difference is that in English, *result from* and *thanks to* must be followed by nominal expressions while in Chinese, seven logical resultative formulae such as *jiran(既然/since)*, *yinwei* (*因为/because*）, *yinwei…suo(因为…所以/ because… so), jiran…jiu(既然…就/since… then), youyu…yinci (由于/since…因此/thus), youyu…suoyi (由于/since…所以/so), shiyinwei(是因为/The reason is …)* can be followed by either nominal expressions or clauses.

From the Dimension of the Distribution of Evaluative Polarity

TABLE 4 DISTRIBUTION OF EVALUATIVE POLARITY OF ENGLISH LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE

ELRF	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Semantic Prosody
[Result] from	3.44%	77.59%	18.97%	Neutral/ Negative
Thanks to	30.43%	65.22%	4.35%	Neutral/ Positive
So that	0%	100%	0%	Neutral
Now that	1.12%	96.35%	2.53%	Neutral
As a result	0%	98.12%	1.88%	Neutral

TABLE 5 DISTRIBUTION OF EVALUTIVE POLARITY OF CHINESE LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE

CLRF	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Semantic Prosody
Yici (因此/thus)	15%	75%	10%	Negative □ Positive □Neutral
Suoyi (所以/so)	19.35%	59.68%	20.97%	Neutral □Negative □Positive
Yushi (于是/then)	6.85%	91.78%	1.37%	Neutral
Yiner (因而/therefore)	17.46%	66.6%	24.75%	Neutral □Positive □Negative
Jiran (既然/since)	4.44%	86.67%	8.89%	Neutral
Yinwei (因为/because)	5.88%	66.67%	24.75%	Neutral □Negative
Yinwei…suoyi (因为…所以 /because…so)	3.82%	87.02%	9.16%	Neutral
Jiran…jiu (既然…就/since…then)	10.45%	80.23%	9.31%	Neutral □Positive
Youyu…yinci (由于…因此/since…thus)	4.79%	87.55%	7.68%	Neutral
Youyu…suoyi (由于…所以/ owing to…so)	6.12%	76.39%	17.49%	Neutral □Negative
Zhisuoyi…shiyinwei (之所以…是因为/What it is is because…)	25.82%	61.57%	12.61%	Neutral □Positive □Negative

From Table 4, it can be seen that among the five English logical resultative formulae,

two have the multivariate semantic prosody pattern and the other three have the univariate semantic prosody pattern. *Result from* and *thanks to* belong to the former and *so that*, *now that*, *as a result* to the latter. *Result from* and *thanks to* have almost the equal semantic prosody pattern, that is, for both of them the dominant evaluative polarity is the neutral one. The difference is that the second type of evaluative polarity for *result from* and *thanks to* is the negative one and the positive one respectively. And the ration of the negative one is much higher than that of the positive one.

For *so that, now that, as a result*, the dominant semantic prosody is the neutral one, because neutral evaluative polarity plays a completely dominant role and the other evaluative polarity rarely emerges.

From Table 5, it can be noted that among the 11 Chinese logical resultative formulae, seven have the multivariate semantic prosody pattern and four have the univariate semantic prosody pattern. *Yinci(因此/thus), suoyi (所以/so), yin'er(因而/ thus), yinwei (因为/because), jiran…jiu(既然…就/since… then), youyu…suoyi (由于/since…所以/so)* and *shiyinwei(是因为/The reason is ...)* are of the feature of the former one while *yushi(于是/ then), jiran(既然/since), yinwei…suo(因为…所以/ because… so)* and *youyu…yinci (由于/since…因此/thus)* are of the feature of the latter one. For the seven logical resultative formulae, the dominant evaluative polarity is the neutral one, the difference among them is that *yinci(因此/thus), yin'er(因而/ thus), jiran…jiu(既然…就/since… then)* and *shiyinwei(是因为/The reason is ...)* have positive evaluative polarity as the secondary evaluative polarity and the negative one as the third evaluative polarity, while *suoyi (所以/so), yinwei (因为/because)* and *youyu…suoyi (由于/since…所以/so)* have negative evaluative polarity as the second evaluative polarity and positive evaluative polarity as the third one.

For *yushi(于是/ then), jiran(既然/since), yinwei…suo(因为…所以/ because… so)* and *youyu…yinci (由于/since…因此/thus)*, the dominant semantic prosody is the neutral one, because the neutral takes up the largest portion and the other two (positive and negative) only the tiny portion.

The above analysis reveals the fact that although English and Chinese logical resultative formulae have something in common in the aspect of semantic prosody, the differences between them are obvious. These differences may be accounted for by the following two reasons. First, the syntactic restriction is the impact factor. For example, English logical resultative formulae *result from* and *thanks to* must be followed by nominal expressions and *so that, now that, as a result* must be followed by clauses; yet, there is no strict syntactic restriction for Chinese logical resultative formulae. Second, it might be the complexity of a nation's character and personality

that caused the differences.

CONTRAST BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CHINESE LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE EXPRESSING MIXED SEMANTIC PROSODY

From the Dimension of Collocates and Semantic Preferences

TABLE 6 LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE

EXPRESSING MIXED SEMANTIC PROSODY

<table>
<tr><th>ELRF</th><th>Semantic preferences</th><th>Collocates</th></tr>
<tr><td>So…that</td><td rowspan="5"></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Because of</td><td rowspan="4">[Bring about]
Positive: change, revolution, solution, reforms, etc.
Negative: destruction, collapse, downfall, etc.
Neutral: make over, etc.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Bring about</td></tr>
<tr><td>Due to</td></tr>
<tr><td>Result in</td></tr>
<tr><td>CLFR</td><td>Semantic Preferences</td><td>Collocates</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Yuanyin shi (原因是/The reason is…)</td><td>Referential meaning</td><td>Duofangmian /多方面, jingji/经济, zhengfu/政府, lingdao/领导/, gaige/改革, touzi/ 投资, etc</td></tr>
<tr><td>Increase or insufficiency</td><td>Zengjia/增加, quefa/缺乏, etc</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td>Cause</td><td>Yuanyin/原因, yuangu / 缘故, etc</td></tr>
<tr><td>Transformation, impacts, insufficiency</td><td>Fazhan /发展, bianhua/变化, yingxiang/影响, xianzhi/限制, jinzhang /紧张, queshao/缺少, etc.</td></tr>
</table>

The logical resultative formulae presented in Table 6 are those which express mixed semantic prosody, namely, they can co-occur with any nominal expressions or clauses having positive, negative, and neutral attitudinal meaning. The collocates of these words are diversified. And semantic preferences of Chinese logical resultative formulae are multi-faceted; for instance, referential meaning, the increase or insufficiency, causes, transformation, impacts, insufficiency, etc. Here, such English logical resultative formulae as *so…that, because of, bring about, due to, result in* and Chinese ones as *yuanyin shi (原因是/The reason is…) and youyu (由于/owing to)* display similarities. The difference lies in the fact that for Chinese logical resultative formulae, after analyzing the data, the types of semantic preferences can be singled out, yet it's hard for one to pick out the types of semantic preferences of English logical resultative formulae from analyzing the corpus.

From the Dimension of the Distribution of Evaluative Polarity

Three findings can be drawn from Table 7. First, both English and Chinese logical resultative formulae have the multivariate pattern. Since the semantic prosody of these logical resultative formulae is mixed, it implies that three types of evaluative polarity can be seen in most cases, but it doesn't mean that the three types occupy the same position, rather, one can be the majority and the other two can be the minority. Second, for both English and Chinese logical resultative formulae, the representative evaluative polarity is the neutral one. And for both English and Chinese, the negative is the most often emerged evaluative polarity. Third, such English logical resultative formulae as *so… that, due to* and *result in* share this pattern: neutral ^ negative ^ positive, *bring about* has neutral ^ positive ^ negative pattern and *because of* negative ^ neutral ^ positive pattern. For two Chinese logical resultative formulae, different patterns can be found: *yuanyin shi(原因是/The reason is)* presents neutral ^negative ^positive pattern and *youyu /(由于/since)* negative + neutral + positive pattern.

TABLE 7 DISTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATIVE POLARITY OF ENGLISH AND CHINESE LOGICAL RESULTATIVE FORMULAE

LRF	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Semantic Prosody
So…that	25%	45.59%	29.41%	Mixed (Neutral ^ Negative + Positive)
Because of	15.79%	40.35%	43.86%	Mixed (Negative ^ Neutral ^ Positive)
[Bring about]	31.71%	36.58%	31.71%	Mixed (Neutral ^ Positive +Negative)
Due to	13.30%	46.70%	40%	Mixed (Neutral + Negative ^ Positive)
[Result] in	17.24%	48.28%	34.48%	Mixed (Neutral ^ Negative ^ Positive)
Yuanyin shi (原因是/The reason is…)	7.69%	48.08%	44.23%	Mixed (Neutral + Negative ^ Positive)
Youyu (由于/since)	13.23%	39.71%	47.06%	Mixed (Negative + Neutral ^ Positive)

CONCLUSION

This article, starting from corpus-based approach, conducts a contrastive study on semantic prosody of logical resultative formulae between English and Chinese. This study reveals the complexity of the semantic prosody of logical resultative formulae between English and Chinese. These words are frequently used to express link (bridge) between two components; actually in discourse, while they are employed to express conjunctive meaning, they tend to express a kind of attitudinal meaning owing to their frequent collocation with the words which have the same or similar meaning potential. Both English and Chinese have these kinds of words and also same or different types

of semantic prosody. While teaching or learning English and Chinese logical resultative formulae, we should try to be aware of such differences in semantic prosody so as to avoid semantic clash in the context.

ACKLEDGEMENT

I acknowledge thanks to the support given by China Ministry of Education Humanities and Social Science Research Planning Fund Project (No. 12YJA740039).

REFERENCES

[1]Hunston, S 2007, 'Semantic prosody revisited', *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics,* vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 249-268.

[2]Li, Meixia and Jiao, Aihui 2012, 'A corpus-based study to semantic prosodies of Chinese logical resultative formulae', *Proceedings of the 1st annual international conference on language. literature & linguistics*, Global Science and Technology Forum, pp. 155-161.

[3] Li, Meixia and Jiao, Aihui 2013. 'The study of semantic prosody of English logical resultative formulae: a corpus-based approach', *Foreign Language Education*, no.2, pp. 21-26.

[4] Louv, B 1993, 'Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies,' in M. Backer, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds), *Text and technology: in honour of John Sinclair*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp.157-176.

[5] Partington, A 1998, *Patterns and meanings: using corpora for English language research and teaching*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

[6] Partington, A 2004, Utterly content in each other's company: semantic prosody and semantic preference, *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 131-156.

[7] Sinclair, J 1991, *Corpus concordance collocation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[8]Stubbs, M 1995, 'Collocations and semantic profiles: On the cause of trouble with quantitative studies', *Functions of Language*, vol.2, no.1, pp. 23-55.

[9]Stubbs, M 2001, *Words and phrases: corpus studies of lexical semantics*, New York: Blackwell.

[10]Tribble, C 2000, 'Genres, keywords, teaching: towards a pedagogic account of the language of project proposals, in L. Burnard and A. McEnery (eds), *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective: papers from the Third International Conference on Teaching and Language Corpora* . Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 74-90.

[11]Whitsitt, S 2005, 'A critique of the concept of semantic prosody', *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 10*(3), pp. 283-305.

[12]Stewart, D 2010, *Semantic prosody: A critical evaluation*, London and New York: Routledge.

[13]Peterson, Carole and McCabe, Allyssa 1985, 'Understanding "because": how important is the task?' *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 14(2), pp. 199-218.

[14]Xu, Shenghuan and Li, Shujing 2005, 'The evolution of English causality sentence', *Foreign Languages Research*, no.1, pp. 56-62.

[15]Liao, Qiaoyun 2007, 'A research into English causality construction', *Foreign Languages Study*, no. 3, pp. 24-27.

[16]Xu, Yulong 2002, *Contrastive linguistics.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

iafor