

**Mario Brdar**

Josip Juraj Strossmayer University  
Faculty of Philosophy  
Osijek

**Hubert Cuyckens, Thomas Berg, René Dirven, Klaus-Uwe Panther, eds. 2003. *Motivation in Language: Studies in Honor of Günter Radden*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: xxvi + 403pp. ISBN 978 90 272 4755 1.**

The volume under review is a collection of seventeen papers to honour Professor Gunter Radden, one of the founding fathers of cognitive linguistics, on the occasion of his 60<sup>th</sup> birthday. The common thread running through all the contributions in this collection is the search for “conceptual factors underlying or motivating language use” (p. vii).

The book is divided into four sections preceded by R. Dirven’s warm but insightful appraisal of Günter Radden’s research. Individual sections reflect the shift and growth of G. Radden’s linguistic interests during his career, although taking an interesting perspective in retracing his intellectual path in a backward manner, as I will try to demonstrate in the rest of this review. In view of the fact that the thematic organization and the sequencing of the contents of the volume, Cognitive Grammar, and cognitive linguistics in general, are understandably the dominant though not the only theoretical framework employed in the book.

The first section entitled *The Motivation in Lexico-Grammar*, which is the strongest in terms of the number of contributions (comprising almost a third of all the papers, and stretching over more than a third of the whole volume) examines a number of aspects of various linguistic structures in the continuum between lexicon and grammar that fall within the purview of motivation as a multifactorial phenomenon, which is G. Radden’s most recent focus research agenda.

The section opens with R. Langacker’s paper on the relation between subjectification and grounding elements, specifically English tense and modal verbs. Subjectification has to do with a particular way of construing a scene—it is a semantic shift in which an entity originally construed objectively receives a more subjective construal. A subjectively construed entity no longer constitutes an object of conceptualization, but rather is a part of the conceptualization process itself. In other words, it is “the loss of an objectively construed entity, leaving behind a subjective counterpart” (p. 5). Subjectification may also be seen as

a process whereby an element or a construction develops new senses that require speaker-reference. Grounding as a technical term is used to refer to grammatical predications indicating the relationship of a designated entity to the ground or speech situation, which includes the actual speech event, its participants, and its immediate circumstances, such as speech act time. It is achieved by means of the tense system for temporal relationships and by the determiner system for referential relations, i.e. grounding predications turn nouns into nominals and verbs into finite clauses. English tense and modal verbs are grammaticized grounding elements where the ground (the speech event & its participants) is “offstage” and subjectively construed. Certain uses of grounding elements, such as present-time epistemic uses of the modals as well as a host of other uses of the present tense that do not actually refer to present time, pose special problems of description and analysis. These uses are analysed in the paper as carrying the subjectification process one step further by eliminating any direct concern with the occurrence of actual events. Extreme subjectification in the case of modals is attributed to the fact that mental extrapolation inducing a force-dynamic experience no longer pertains to events in the extralinguistic reality but rather to what the speaker knows about a situation. Similarly, the occurrence of a process precisely coincident with the time of speech “is no longer an actual occurrence but rather a conceptual occurrence created by ‘reading’ of a ‘virtual document’” (p. 23).

The central question in Taylor’s contribution (“Meaning and context”), inspired by Gleitman (1990) and Wilkins (1993/4), is what it means to know the meaning of a word. Gleitman argued that verb meanings cannot be inferred solely from the extralinguistic context of their use and that crucial information about a verb’s meaning can only come from the kinds of linguistic contexts in which the verb is used. Taylor suggests that linguistic context should be “understood rather broadly, to include much more than simply the subcategorization frames” (p.44) in which words occur. Wilkins, on the other hand, points out that the idiosyncratic facts of the syntactic behaviour of the English verb *put* accordingly, presents us with a severe case of the ‘negative evidence problem’. Taylor reviews Wilkins’ arguments and demonstrates that she greatly exaggerated the problematic nature of this verb because the data indicate that the syntax of this verb closely matches its semantics, as corroborated by the fact children acquire it at a very early age.

Croft’s starting point in “Lexical rules vs. constructions: A false dichotomy” is the observation that verbs, specifically verbs that appear in the ditransitive construction, appear to change their meaning depending on the particular constructions in which they are used. Thus, two alternative analyses have been proposed in literature to account for the fact that the meaning of *bake* is enriched to ‘bake x and give x to someone’ in the ditransitive construction. The traditional

generative approach was to derive the meaning of *bake* in the ditransitive construction by a lexical rule. In the constructional approach, the additional element of meaning of *bake* in the ditransitive construction is attributed to the semantics of the construction itself. Croft submits that this lexical-constructionist debate hinges on a false dichotomy, and that both analyses are in part correct (and that both are wrong in certain respects). He shows that the ability to enter the ditransitive construction is verb-class-specific, or even verb-specific, which clearly undermines any sweeping approach resulting in massive overgeneralization. At the same time, his analysis shows that verbs appearing in similar constructions will exhibit similar additional elements of meaning, which implies that the meaning of the verb (class) found in the ditransitive is peculiar to the ditransitive construction and that it clearly involves a family resemblance to the meaning of other verb classes found in the construction. It is argued that the simplest way to capture these facts is to postulate both verb-class-specific constructions and verb-specific constructions in the grammar of English.

Kemmer's chapter ("Schemas and lexical blends") is a schema-based and usage-based analysis of lexical blends such as *glitterati* and *carjacking*, which are notoriously difficult for traditional compositional morpheme-based frameworks. The paper demonstrates that Cognitive Grammar, which makes use of constructs such as composition entrenchment, as well as the notion of conceptual blending from Turner and Fauconnier (1995), is able to provide a coherent theory of lexical blends account for their place in morphology. Kemmer shows that conceptual blending is at work here because blends like *glitterati* can be interpreted only if both the putative input words *glitter* and *literati* are invoked together with whole ICMs (Idealized Cognitive Models) or domains of which the input words partake. The result of the conceptual blending of the two domains is not simply the sum of the source domains but is in fact very selective because only certain specific elements are chosen from the source domains and merged into a functional whole. For example, it is not the whole domain of GLITTER that is mapped: a number of concepts can be invoked in theory, some by means of metonymy and metaphor. What is actually selected in the blend is an elite group of people who *glitter* metaphorically and metonymically: in terms of their fame, beauty and prospects, and often concerning their clothes and jewellery. It is claimed that some sort of integration at the conceptual level is operative in all types of lexical blends. Such lexical blends may become the nucleus of a new, analogical word formation process that can in due time generate a whole family of words, and ultimately, lead to morphological reanalysis resulting in newly entrenched bound morphemes.

Vater takes as his starting point Ágel's (1995) proposal to distinguish between valency potential, which is claimed to be inherent in a verb's lexicon entry, on

the one hand, and valency realization, which is determined by the interaction of valency potential, sentence structure, and communicative factors, and applies this approach in accounting for diathesis alternations of the German verb *öffnen* 'open.' The applicability of this two level approach in valency lexicography is examined is proposed.

Diathesis phenomena are also in the focus of the last paper in this section ("To get or to be? Use and acquisition of *get-* versus *be-*passives: Evidence from children and adults"). Meints presents new experimental data on the use and the acquisition of the *get-* and *be-*passive by 2-4-year-old British children, as compared with the acquisition of passives by American children. This is supplemented by acceptability judgements of adult native speakers of British English concerning *get-* and *be-*passives, respectively. Regardless of the degree of direct affectedness of the patient British children prefer central passives, with *get-*passives being more peripheral members of the category "passive," in contrast to American children, where direct affectedness of the patient correlated with a significantly higher amount of *get-*passives. Since British English speakers rate *be-*passives consistently as better examples of passive sentences than *get-*passives, it is claimed that in addition to semantic and pragmatic factors underlying the prototype approach, the conspicuous preferences in the parental usage may also be considered to be a motivating factor here.

The second section, Motivation in the Lexicon, is similarly concerned with linguistic phenomena in which non-arbitrary links between form and meaning play a role, but focuses on particular types of lexical items, notably on prepositions and postpositions, which is of course also connected with the conceptualization of space and time, one of G. Radden's favourite topics from the early 1980's onwards.

In her contribution, "Space and time in Polish: The preposition *za* and the verbal prefix *za-*", Tabakowska argues that general principles of verbal prefixation in contemporary Polish—a notorious problem for structuralist frameworks—may be discovered through a systematic comparison of the semantics of the network categories of verbal prefixes with those of corresponding prepositions. She argues that verbal prefixes cannot be semantically empty and that they never have just an aspectual meaning. She assumes that perfectivizing prefixes originally developed from adnominal elements, which later developed into prepositions. As prefixes they still carry abstract elements of meaning stemming from their original function and they therefore play a significant role in shaping and modifying construals. Various uses of a single pair of cognate items: the preposition *za* and the corresponding perfectivizing verbal prefix *za-*, are adduced as evidence for her claims.

Combining the insights of Grammaticalization theory, as developed by B. Heine and his associates, with a more general cognitive linguistic approach, M. Reh shows in her paper, “Functions of the preposition *kuom* in Dholuo,” that the seemingly heterogenous uses of the Dholuo preposition *kuom* are nevertheless semantically related to each other through an image schema called CONTACT-CUM-SOLID. It is demonstrated that conceptual metaphors such as AFFLICTING IS COLLIDING, SEEING IS TOUCHING and X IS AN OBJECT/SOLID underlie various non-spatial uses of this preposition.

The paper by di Meola (“Grammaticalization of postpositions in German”) examines morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties of a small class of German lexical items reanalyzed as postpositions, such as *gegenüber* ‘opposite’ or *gemäß* ‘in accordance with’ on the basis of a 5 million word corpus of written German. Postpositions are demonstrated to shed light on the dynamics of grammaticalization processes, and are particularly useful for modelling the continuum between lexical and grammatical categories as well as the relation between synchrony and diachrony. The paper finds two main grammaticalization channels for postpositions in German: postpositions can arise from content words (adverbs, adjectives, verbs) as well as from syntactic structures (prepositional phrases). The statistical part of the investigation is concerned with positional variation (postposing/preposing) and alternating government (dative/genitive), which are analyzed as a result of ongoing diachronic syntactic changes.

Barcelona’s contribution (“Metonymy in cognitive linguistics: An analysis and a few modest proposals”) is a discussion of a series of unresolved fundamental issues raised by the standard theory of conceptual metonymy in cognitive linguistics aiming at reforming and refining the theory. Notwithstanding the understatement in the second part of the subtitle, this is an extremely thoughtful and stimulating paper, which goes well beyond the confines of this section. The backbone of the article is formed by an extensive list of properties of metonymy found in literature. Barcelona first singles out several of these as relatively uncontroversial and then proceeds with a meticulous analysis of the entity vs. domain issue, the single-domain vs. two-domain issue, the questions of mapping and activation, the problem of subdomain centrality, and referentiality. He concurs with the standard Lakovian view on metonymy as a mapping. Metonymies are considered “mappings” because the metonymic source is connected to the metonymic target by imposing a perspective on it. According to the standard view, metonymy is a mapping within one domain. Barcelona has it as a mapping of a cognitive domain, the source, onto another domain, the target. The two domains, the source and the target are in the same functional domain and are linked by a pragmatic function, so that the target is mentally activated. Barce-

Iona proposes a broad notion of metonymy capable of capturing degrees of metonymicity, and distinguishes four tightly interrelated types of conceptual metonymy. Schematic metonymy, the most general type of conceptual metonymy, contains all the necessary and sufficient conditions for metonymicity. In peripheral or purely schematic instances of metonymy, target is a primary or near primary domain in the source. Prototypical metonymy is referential and has an individual as target. Prototypical metonymies are “classical” instances of metonymy. Typical metonymies are not referential and their target is not an individual, but an abstract concept such as property or state. In typical and prototypical metonymies the target remains neatly distinct from the source, that is, it is either not included in the source or it is a secondary domain in it. Conventional metonymies follow “one of the ‘natural’ patterns or types of metonymic relationships” (p. 243), and are socially sanctioned. All the other types of metonymies may become conventionalized.

Section 3, “Motivation in Socio-Cultural Conceptualizations,” looks at factors motivating content or meaning of linguistic items situated in and conceptualizing the socio-cultural domain. Ikegami’s paper (“How language is conceptualized and metaphorized in Japanese: An essay on language ideology”) discusses the traditional conceptualization of language in Japan. Unlike English, as discussed by Reddy (1979), which relies on the contrast between content (unbounded) and container (bounded), and where articulation is conceptualized as putting the unbounded content into the bounded container, language is in Japanese culture not so much conceived of as an object but as the speaking subject’s activity. Language is in Japanese predominantly metaphorized as a fluid, the underling idea being that what the speaker has in mind/heart) transforms itself into language, without being “poured” into some kind of container.

The central hypothesis in Janicki’s paper (“The ever-stifling essentialism: Language and conflict in Poland (1991-1993)”) is that a “speaker’s/hearer’s set of fundamental beliefs about language will markedly contribute to alleviating or deepening conflicts” (p.273). A theoretical part of the paper first provides the philosophical background of essentialism and shows how it is reflected in language, after which Janicki states his non-essentialist view of meaning and definitions which allows for individual differences as well as for a significant degree of word meaning overlap, dictated by the experience shared by the speakers of a particular language or language community. The empirical part of the chapter discusses two conflicts in the post-communist that Poland that centered around the issue of abortion and around Christian values and censorship. The analysis of the data reveals that the essentialist point of view and use of language is conducive to conflict.

“Motion metaphorized in the economic domain” by O. Jäkel is a study of metaphorical projections in the economic domain as a target domain that have to do with movement in English and German. Two major subgroups of within the metaphorical movement models are HORIZONTAL MOVEMENT and VERTICAL MOVEMENT. Within the latter it is possible to differentiate between ORGANIC GROWTH, ACTIVE VERTICAL MOVEMENT and PASSIVE VERTICAL MOVEMENT. Finally, the author suggests probable reasons why certain particular models identified by the investigation are made use of.

Section 4, Motivation in Applied Linguistics, contains three papers discussing various applied linguistics domains. Edmondson and House (“English in the world and English in the school”) claim that with the emergence and spread of English as a lingua franca (ELF), the goals and content of English as a foreign language teaching programs need to be radically reexamined. Specifically, they plead for placing more stress on intercultural awareness in the teaching of English literature and of English cultural studies, inside the German secondary school system, but also in a broader perspective.

In “Attitudes towards Luganda, Kiswahili, English, and mother tongue as media of instruction in Uganda,” Sprenger-Tasch shows that ethnic origin and personal background are the most important factors determining the attitude towards English, Kiswahili, Luganda and indigenous native languages spoken in Uganda. Variables like social status, educational background, and profession are much less important in this respect, though they influence the degree of competence in these languages. The data collected for this study show that the role of English remains unchallenged in education, although Kiswahili is steadily gaining in importance as an alternative to the highly controversial Luganda.

The last paper in the volume, “Style labels in monolingual English learner’s dictionaries” by W.K. Hünig compares four most important British learners’ dictionaries with respect to how they use stylistic labels. As expected, the results of the comparison are not favourable for these dictionaries. There is a lot of variation with respect to the number of stylistic labels used, which is of course indicative of conceptual overlaps. The information which the dictionaries convey through their stylistic labels such as ‘derogatory,’ ‘formal,’ etc. is not very reliable and learners who expect hard & fast rules have to be made aware of the fact that they should take into account. Most of the stylistic labels can only be taken as hints, which have to be fine-tuned in different social and discourse contexts. Exchanges in such contexts may have very different functions & may reflect different social relationships. The learners also have to be made aware of the need to take into consideration the whole communicative context as well as human

face needs. Besides, they will have to bear in mind that meanings change with time, effecting more or less permanent shifts in the linguistic system.

Overall, there is no doubt that the volume under review constitutes a major addition to the study of non-arbitrary aspects of linguistic phenomena and that it will of interest not only for cognitive linguists but also for a wider audience of functional and typological linguists. It is well worth reading, and re-reading, because it offers a unique insight into the multifaceted nature of the phenomenon of motivation. Despite its blending of various strands of cognitive linguistics with research cast in a different framework (e.g. the contribution by Vater), or with application-minded work, this collection nevertheless makes a very coherent and rewarding reading.

## References

- Ágel, Vilmos (1995). Valenzrealisierung, Grammatik und Valenz. *ZGL. Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 23: 2-32.
- Gleitman, Lila (1990). The structural sources of verb meaning. *Language Acquisition* 1: 3-55.
- Reddy, Michael J. (1979). The conduit metaphor - A case of frame conflict in our language about language. Ortony, Andrew, ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 284-324.
- Turner, Mark, Gilles Fauconnier (1995). Conceptual integration and formal expression. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10.3: 183-204.
- Wilkins, Wendy (1993/4). Lexical learning by error detection. *Language Acquisition* 3: 121-157.