Gabrijela Buljan
Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera
Osijek

Mario Brdar, Ida Raffaelli, Milena Žic Fuchs, eds. (2012). *Cognitive Linguistics between Universality and Variation*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 451 pp. ISBN (10): 1-4438-4057-2, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4057-6.

1. Introduction

This volume represents a collection of papers originally presented at the international conference *Cognitive Linguistics between Universality and Variation* held in 2008 in Dubrovnik (Croatia). The primary goal of the conference was to provide a platform for the discussion of one of the central issues of contemporary Cognitive Linguistics (CL), the issue of universality and variation (see below). Before introducing the structure of the volume, let me first summarize the editorial mission statement from the introductory chapter, which provides an excellent framework within which the reader can assess not only the individual contributions to the volume but also the state-of-the-art of the cognitive linguistic enterprise.

2. Universality vs. variation

The aim of this volume is to reflect the current state of play in CL. This is the state which the editors aptly described as a necessary and ongoing balancing act between converging and diverging tendencies in CL, between universality and variation. In the following sections I will make occasional reference to how the individual chapters square with this general agenda, and therefore a few words are in order about these two key concepts.

On the universal side, there is a fundamental *ideological* assumption of embodied cognition, viz. the pervasive idea that large areas of language are motivated by the facts of human embodiment and how these project into conceptual structures through various cognitive mechanisms. This, the editors argue, has

made many specialists keen on uncovering universal aspects of language, those grounded in experience, and cross-linguistic similarities, if the focus was not on English alone (as was often the case). Many of these assumptions are now being put to the test, as CL opens up to meet diversity in authentic language data embraced by usage-based models, corpus linguistics and sociolinguistics, and cross-linguistic data found in contrastive and contact linguistics (cf. the list of recent conferences, volumes, special issues of linguistic journals on p. x).

Another universalist tendency is the *methodological* quest for conceptual unification (Langacker 1999: 24f); i.e. attempts to come up with a common conceptual basis and a limited set of theoretical constructs for the description of a vast array of language phenomena.

But CL is diversifying too; a sign, in the editors' view, of CL's coming of age. In addition to expanding outwards to seek vindication from neighboring disciplines, CL meets diversity closer to home, i.e. in the development of new frameworks for the explanation of as yet unexplained phenomena, and in the emergence and existence of competing theoretical frameworks, e.g. many strands of construction grammar. Despite this, there is no danger, the editors argue, of CL disintegrating. It is only faced with the challenge of constantly, but patiently testing and adapting its established methodologies, frameworks and tools to accommodate and account for new data.

The volume under review reflects this broad agenda, with individual authors focusing their research on different issues along the universality-variation cline. While the papers differ in their choice of topic, (depth or extent of) theoretical vs descriptive commitment, perspective and methods, they may be said to reflect to a considerable extent the breadth (an aspect of variation), depth (arguably, an aspect of universality) and beauty of cognitive linguistics of the day.

The chapters are organized into 4 thematic sections: 1) Constructional Approaches to Grammatical Phenomena (5 chapters); 2) Dynamic Aspects of Meaning Construction (4 chapters); 3) Across Languages and Cultures (5 chapters); 4) Diachronic Studies (2 chapters). While each section pulls together papers around broad areas of shared interest, the main distinction falls between Section 1, with its heavy focus on grammar/syntax, and the rest of the volume, which addresses other aspects of linguistic convention and use.

3. Survey of Chapters

3.1. *Section I: Constructional Approaches to Grammatical Phenomena*

The first section features five papers on grammatical phenomena in English, or Croatian, using Cognitive Grammar, or the Lexical-Constructional model of construction grammar. The first three papers are similar in general outlook. Although they deal with different phenomena – the first, by Langacker, with the functional basis of English finite clauses, the other two with the Croatian dative case, all three look for the conceptual underpinnings of grammatical categories and for principled ways to account for patterns and variation in language data. All three rely much on what has become the standard jargon of Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 1991), and in using terms such as search domain, trajector, landmark, grounding, type specification etc. they do their part in honoring the plea for conceptual unification.

R. Langacker's *Substrate, System, and Expression: Aspects of the Functional Organization of English Finite Clauses* is a complex, but coherent account of the functional organization of systems structuring English finite clauses. It builds on the idea that linguistic expressions emerge from and are shaped by a conceptual substrate of indefinite extent. This substrate includes stable knowledge but also an awareness of the physical, social and discourse context. Langacker develops a sophisticated system of functional categories such as *existence, perspective, modality, negotiation, polarity* to account for the functional organization of the finite clause, and integrates them into the main fabric of Cognitive Grammar. An important, long recognized, aspect of the systemic organization of grammatical categories is the presence of the unmarked (zero)/marked asymmetry among category members. A special value of this paper is in applying the idea of systems with unmarked zero defaults to an area which is not traditionally interpreted in such terms, i.e. the systems characterizing English finite clauses (cf. 12). Here, the zero default is the baseline clause, which represents minimum conceptual complexity with respect to different aspects of the conceptual substrate: the clause is structurally very simple and represents default values in respect of epistemic and interactive factors. Such clauses lack auxiliary elements (apart from the tense marked on the lexical verb).They represent the *default viewing arrangement:* the interlocutors are together in a fixed position and report on what they observe in a neutral fashion, etc. Non-baseline clauses are then painstakingly explained as departures from this baseline substrate in terms of increasing conceptual complexity along vari-

ous dimensions. One simple illustrative example would be the system of passive, progressive, perfective etc. constructions, allowing for 'perspectival adjustments' in apprehending events and situations: interlocutors are no longer observing the profiled occurrence and reporting on it in a neutral fashion, they become more active, since the speaker imposes a particular perspective on the lexically specified type for discourse purposes. The result is one of the many kinds of departures from the baseline substrate, which are extensively explored in this thought-provoking, if highly technical chapter.

The next two chapters are attempts to come to grips with the semantic and usage complexities of the Croatian dative case, and as such both represent a dramatic and welcome conceptual leap away from the standard practice of Croatian grammars of referring to the different meanings of morphological cases as little more than lists of homonymous relations. The paper by Belaj and Tanacković Faletar *Space, Conceptualisation and Case Meaning: A Cognitive Account of the Dative in Croatian* argues vigorously for the existence of a conceptual motivation for all the varied meanings of the Croatian dative case in contemporary usage. In this way, not only do they prove the inadequacy of the 'homonymy' approach to morphological case meanings, but also propose a motivated and highly integrated taxonomic system of conceptual schemas for the meanings of the dative. Their account can arguably even improve on some other cognitive linguistic accounts of the Slavic dative case (Dabrowska 1997, Palić 2006, Šarić 2008), which, according to the authors, could not adequately fit the allative 'outlier' into the explanatory system provided by the concepts "Target Person" and "Personal Sphere". The authors argue for one single superschema at the highest level of this taxonomy, i.e. the abstract concept of proximity, itself derived from the simpler concept of directed movement. Being that movement and space lend themselves to metaphorical reconstrual, this system was argued to be capable of explaining the motivation for the dative meanings in the scenarios as diverse as physical allative and ablative, physical and non-physical transfer and non-transfer scenarios found in a range of syntactic constructions.

The paper by Stanojević and Tuđman Vuković *Dominion, Subjectification and the Croatian Dative* takes this discussion closer to the level of linguistic usage, methodologically speaking. The authors use corpus data to account for the distribution of nouns, non-clitic and clitic pronouns in the four semantic configurations: *allative, transfer, assessment,* and *reference-point/affectedness.* The goal of this study was to explore how the notions of dominion and subjectification and the concept of "search dominion" (a concept newly proposed to ac-

commodate as yet unexplained data – see above) can be used to account for the intricacies of the Croatian dative: more precisely, how two organizing principles: a) the shift from patterns without mental contact to those with obligatory mental contact, and b) the shift from the more objective to more subjective configurations are reflected in the formal expression of the dative referent and semantic and structural characteristics of each of the four configurations. Here, a slightly different schematic structure, viz. a schematic reference-point construction, is proposed to underlie the different dative configurations, which vary from pattern to pattern with respect to the affectedness of the dative and subjectification.

Although the two chapters deal with the same topic, they still differ somewhat in their emphases, methodologies, established conceptual frameworks and conceptual explanations advanced for the phenomena observed. Nevertheless, their co-presence in a single volume can be regarded advantageous because: a) it allows specialists to take in at once two alternative challenges to the Croatian linguistic tradition as far as the description of morphological cases; and b) it can stimulate further constructive dialogue between the individual specialists who have already taken up, or will take up, this challenge; cf.

> A second level at which conceptual unification can be observed to the benefit of the community is the level of integration. Individual practitioners of cognitive linguistics should try to integrate various tools they have developed, i.e. methodologies, conceptual apparatus, and terminologies in order to achieve more powerful, higher-level generalizations (p. ix).

The other two chapters feature papers by Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza and his Spanish colleagues, a team of researchers who are developing a particular version of construction grammar, aimed at 'reconciling' cognitive and functional linguistic models, the so-called Lexical Constructional Model (LCM).

The first paper *Lexical-Constructional Subsumption in Resultative Constructions in English*, by Ruiz de Mendoza and Alba Luzondo Oyón discusses the resultative construction in English grammar, a pet topic of syntacticians of all theoretical camps. The authors first present details and problems of some alternative (constructional) approaches to the analysis of grammatical-lexical fusion (*subsumption* in this framework), and then lay out details of the LCM. The latter integrates aspects of Van Valin's Role and Reference Grammar (2005), Goldberg's (2005) Construction Grammar (1995) and Cognitive Semantics. Its constructional focus capitalizes on the received wisdom that syntactic structure can-

not all be considered a reflection of lexical projection. Its lexical templates borrow from Van Valin's model of lexical semantic representation, though they are semantically enriched (cf. the following chapter, p. 138). Cognitive semantics steps in with high-level metaphors and metonymies to account for e.g. the interpretation of resultatives and caused motion constructions as members of a single family of resultatives (based on the STATES ARE LOCATIONS metaphor), and to furnish a set of external constraints/conditions on subsumption, of e.g. activity predicates into constructions with accomplishment configurations (an ACTIVITY IS AN EFFECTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENT), or for inchoative alternations (via the metonymy PROCESS FOR ACTION) etc. Apart form these external constraints, the model includes a number of internal constraints which should all specify more finer-grained conditions for lexical-constructional fusion. In all of this, LCM claims to be "a usage-based model of meaning construction that is capable of explaining these facets of meaning" (p. 122). While the full brunt of this usage-based orientation is not strictly speaking evident in the paper at hand (considering e.g. the number of examples studied to illustrate the workings of specific constraints), the chapter does propose some new factors and parameters to consider (individually and in terms of their interaction) in future accounts of subsumption in resultative (and other) constructions: e.g. two schemas underlying resultative/cause-motion constructions: A>B, in which the object is perceived as undergoing a transcendent change (i.e. *The magician turned the frog into a prince),* and A>A', where the object either changes a property or acquires a new one but does not suffer a substantial change of state (e.g. *The case just broke itself open).*

A first attempt to apply the same model to the analysis of English spatial prepositions is presented in the paper by Navarro I Ferrando *Exploring the Lexical Representation of English Particles in the Lexical Constructional Model*. This chapter also opens with a presentation of the basic architecture of the LCM model, but given its emphasis on spatial particles rather than verbs, it gives longer shrift to the architecture of the lexical template in general and that of spatial particles in particular. This architecture aims to be typologically and phychologically valid, and attempts to capture both the syntactically relevant semantic content (traditionally believed to be the only relevant semantic aspect of lexical templates, but see e.g. Taylor 1996) and pragmatic and other semantic aspects of meaning, preferably through enriched formalism and a system of universal metalanguage. In making these first steps towards a LCM account of spatial prepositions, the author proposes a lexical representation that includes a) the semantic module consisting of topological, dynamic and functional configura-

tions (for which universal semantic meta-language has yet to be developed) and b) the situational type module (expression of position or state).

3.2. *Section II: Dynamic aspects of meaning construction*

Section II features articles which place particular emphasis on the dynamics of meaning construction, whether in understanding or producing idioms, antonymic expressions or dispelling with fallacious theories about specialized terminology symbolizing static, objective concepts.

The section opens with Panther and Thornburg's ingenious exploratory study of the properties and dynamics of *Antonymy in Language Structure and Use*. The paper is a natural extension of the authors' well-documented commitment to uncovering linguistic generalizations that take account of factors of pragmatic nature and often involve metonymy (cf. Panther and Thornburg's pragmatic typology of metonymy (2000), or their edited 2003 volume). Here, the authors argue that a proper treatment of antonymic phenomena (conventional and innovative) requires a theory of pragmatic (incl. metonymic) reasoning, which should be an integral part of CL theories. In this way, they honor the plea for conceptual unification since a common set of conceptual tools and premises (metonymic inferencing, prototypes, inseparability of semantics and pragmatics) is used to account for the conceptual relation of antonymy at the lexical, constructional and pragmatic-inferential levels. The following hypothesis is explored: since words may spontaneously evoke their opposites (p.161), this tendency should be reflected to an extent in language structure and use. After adopting the broad view of antonymy (including, in addition to binary and polar opposites, multiple incompatibilities, converse or reverse opposites, etc.), the authors explore a selection of antonymic phenomena on the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes of language structure and use. Here I will focus on just two. Paradigmatically, they explore lexical 'autoantonymy', essentially a type of polysemy where one lexeme has two opposite senses. Although they look into some candidates suggested in an on-line discussion (Linguist List), they conclude that autoantonymy is rare. Typically one of the antonymous senses will have become obsolete, or fail to meet the conceptual or grammatical criterion for antonymy. Potential candidates which the authors did not include, but might perhaps be considered autoantonymous are denominal verbs of the type: goal verb *shelve a plant* vs ornative *shelve the wardrobe*; or source verb *tree a cat* vs ornative *tree an avenue* (cf. Buck 1997). Syntagmatically, the authors discuss several cases of

syntagmatic antonymy, focusing especially on the [Y & Y *alike*] construction. It hosts conventionally or contextually antonymous lexemes (binary, polar opposites, multiple incompatibilities, those contrasting in prototypicality), in *single and married alike, old and young alike,* and *sparrows and shoebills alike*, respectively. After arguing that the antonymous lexemes provide maximally contrastive class members supporting metonymic inferencing to all class members (with possible exception of binary opposites which conventionally have no intermediary members/states), the authors propose the meaning and inferential properties of the construction which can account for all of its aspects studied in the paper. In that way they provide compelling arguments for a greater presence of pragmatic forces/principles in accounts of (lexico)grammatical phenomena.

A Cognitive Approach to Synonymy in Terminology by Sabela Fernández-Silva et. al. is a most interesting account of the historic U-turn made by studies of terminology towards a more natural, CL, outlook. By extending the analytical concepts of CL (ICMs, perspective, categorization, motivation etc.) to the study of terminology, the authors contribute to a natural diversification of CL towards an area that has been relatively self-contained (cf. 190). At the same time, they provide natural and coherent explanations of synonymy, despite traditional theoretical pretense that it should not/cannot occur in the terminological organization of objective knowledge systems. Since the first researchers, incidentally technical experts/not linguists, were concerned with the unambiguous transfer of specialized knowledge in an international community, they appealed to the objectivist model of concepts/concept structuring. This is where the authors of this chapter step in to advocate the anti-objectivist epistemological position of CL (Lakoff 1987) in the area traditionally assumed to be impervious to variability and subjectivity. They carry out a corpus-based study of synonymy in French and Galician specialized texts on fishing and shellfish farming, to show that traditional theories of terminology fail to account for the patterns of synonym use. Assuming that terminological units are simultaneously units of knowledge, language and communication, the authors stress their motivated and variable nature and similarity to other linguistic units. Synonymy is explained as a natural occurrence, where a single concept can be lexicalized through different 'denominative variants' under the impact of at least 3 different factors: a) the perspective imposed by different subject fields: i.e. economy and biology giving these alternatives for e.g. ACTIVITY OF SHELLFISH FARMING: *producción* (economics), *cultivo* (biology); b) the sender's intention in communicating specialized knowledge: e.g. for THE OBJECT OF THE ACTIVITY OF FISHING there are variant terms corresponding to the intentions of managing fishing resources: *ressource, res-*

source halieutique (category RESOURCE), marketing (category PRODUCT): *produits de la peche,* etc; c) the choice of ICMs for the understanding of a concept; i.e. the concept SHELLFISH BREEDER: *productor* (PRODUCTION ICM); *mariscador* 'shellfisher' (SHELLFISHING ICM); *recolector* 'harvester' (DISTRIBUTION ICM). There clearly is more work to be done to find other motivating factors behind synonymy and to more strongly challenge the received wisdom about (lack of) synonymy in terminology, which might still dominate popular thinking.

Svetlana Gorokhova's chapter *Semantic Decomposability of Idioms* is a valuable contribution to the phycholinguistic study of the processing of idiomatic expressions during natural speech production. After an extensive survey of different theories of idiom comprehension and production, focusing on the typical problem areas, such as idiom decomposability, non-compositionality, mental storage, the author sets out to explore 121 examples of naturally produced Russian speech errors involving idiomatic expressions. While the author is careful not to announce any definitive conclusions regarding tendencies of idioms to decompose during speech production (inviting more research on the topic), the result of this study is a general outline of the factors which lead to idiom decomposition during on-line production. Evidence from speech errors suggests that idioms are likely to be semantically decomposed under he following three conditions (I shall only exemplify one): a) when the idiom is in competition with another synonymous expression (idiomatic or literal), often leading to idiom blends; b) when its literal, rather than figurative meaning is activated; or c) under the impact of another word from the same utterance causing semantic interference (co-called contextual semantic substitutions, p. 224), e.g. *Čestno govorja, položa ruku na* ***serdce*** (lit. *honestly* ***speaking****, putting hand on* ***heart***) → *… položa ruku na* ***jazyk*** (lit. *honestly* ***speaking****, putting hand on* ***tongue***), a case of lexical substitution error triggered by the preceding adverbial participle *speaking.*

Imageable Idioms in Croatian by Vlatko Broz closes this section with a preliminary report of his cognitive-linguistic study of 40 selected imageable idioms in a sample of 200 native speakers of Croatian. The study was based on a set of hypotheses: a) that idioms may invoke vivid and imageable scenes; b) that speakers share tacit knowledge about the conceptual underpinnings of idioms, which can be uncovered experimentally by asking speakers to describe their mental image(s) of specific idiomatic expressions (which can be expected to be quite consistent in a community of speakers); c) that people's understanding of their mental images for idioms is constrained by conceptual mappings between

source and target domains (if metaphorically motivated), or by conventional (cultural) knowledge or even folk etymologies associated with the idiomatic expression in a given community of speakers. The study was designed to indicate the extent to which images associated with animal idioms coincide in the sample of speakers and to elicit their explanations of the presumed motivation for the selected idioms. The results seemed to indicate, however, that consistency in the mental images was variable and unpredictable, with some images fairly consistent (horse imagery), others less so (due, arguably, to less transparent figurative meanings), and others still triggering quite fanciful idiosyncrasies (i.e. association of *newspaper duck* with a nursery rhyme *Pliva patka preko Save, nosi pismo navrh glave*). While the results suggest that the 'true', 'original' cognitive motivation of idioms may not always be accessible to the average speaker, especially with less transparent or semantically analyzable idioms, the author agrees with Lakoff (1987) that there is always pressure to find some kind of motivation when trying to make sense of idioms. This points not only to the important *cognitive* function of conventional images, more local images and folk etymologies alike, but also to their important role in exposing places where mind, culture and language meet to reveal how we think, reason and talk.

3.3. *Section III: Across Languages and Cultures*

This section features five chapters which are perhaps most intimately biased towards variability in language structure and use. But being that variability can only really be appreciated against some shared background, most of these chapters are actually looking into how universality and variation keep each other in check. This, when translators look for the culturally optimal expression in communicating conceptually and figuratively identical meanings (3rd chapter), when exploring variability in the linguistic expression of shared conceptual metaphors (2nd chapter) or shared concepts (4th chapter), or when discourse context prompts language users away from 'default' choices in the expression of metaphors towards more varied, better-suited contextual alternatives (1st chapter).

Metaphorical Creativity in Discourse by Kövecses is a paper which gives solid footing to the idea that conceptual metaphors are more than just sets of static conventional conceptual mappings between source and target domains. If there was nothing more to them, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) would indeed be hard-pressed to account for the many cases of metaphorical creativity which manifest themselves in natural discourse. In this paper Kövecses explores

the interrelationships between metaphor, discourse and creativity, proposing a coherent and well-integrated picture of the sources of metaphorical creativity. Two major sources are identified, along with a number of subcases. First, the so-called source- and target-related creativity (cf. Kövecses 2005), i.e. cases where a) novel elements of a source domain (source-internal) or novel source domains (source-external) are applied to a given target domain and b) elements of the target which are not normally selected for the expression of metaphorical thought (in traditional terms, those that are conventionally hidden) are utilized and for which matching counterparts are found in the source. These cases, the author argues, were more or less covered in the early statements and elaborations of the CMT through the concepts of elaboration and extension (for source-internal creativity) (Lakoff and Turner 1989), and "range of the target" (for source-external creativity) (Kövecses 2005). However, discourse triggers creativity even more locally (context-induced creativity, cf. Semino 2008): when it allows potential metaphor slots to be filled with elements which best fit the 'flow of frames' already established or made salient in running discourse through a) the immediate linguistic context; b) the immediate cultural context; c) the immediate social context; d) the context of the major entities participating in discourse (speaker, hearer, topic) and e) the physical setting. Although it may not be easy, by the author's admission, to differentiate social from cultural factors, or to tease apart the individual contributions of the different factors when they work in cohort in triggering metaphorical creativity, these factors still go a long way to explaining sources of some of the most spectacular cases of creative metaphors. There is no doubt that any future work in this area will find this framework more than useful in accounting for the creative use of metaphors in discourse.

Schmidt and Brdar's paper *Variation in the Linguistic Expression of Conceptual Metaphor* explores the variability in the linguistic expression of the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A (GAMBLING) GAME in English and Croatian. The general question is: In what ways can the linguistic expression of a shared conceptual metaphor vary? Given the analytical framework adopted to address this question, this chapter may be seen as a contribution to Kövecses's (2005) system for dealing with this type of metaphor variation. The following parameters from Kövecses (2005, Ch 7) are used: degree of linguistic elaboration, kinds of linguistic expressions used, degree of conventionalization, degree of specificity and scope of metaphor. Second, the authors propose that their data might reveal subtle differences in the dominant cultural-ideological background of the respective communities. The cross-linguistic data were obtained using the translation

method, with English expressions as the source of translation. The results were interpreted in accordance with the four-parameter system developed by Kövecses (1005, Ch 7), comparing the translation equivalents with respect to (non)identity of the word form, of the literal and figurative meaning of that word form, and of the underlying conceptual metaphor. The two most frequent patterns involve the use of the same conceptual metaphor in the Croatian translation, with the same figurative meaning, but where the literal meaning of the word form is different, or more rarely the same. Least frequently, the Croatian translation invites a different conceptual metaphor for the expression of the same figurative meaning. Differences were found with the other parameters as well, e.g. in terms of degrees of linguistic elaboration, English outranks Croatian (17 vs 13 metaphorical expressions). Perhaps most interestingly the authors end the paper with a careful formulation of subtle, but potentially real cultural differences between Croats and the English speaking community in thinking about life. They ran an informal Google search of the metaphorical expressions of different LIFE metaphors. This was a follow-up on an earlier study of the ways Hungarians and Americans metaphorize life. The authors provide tentative, but interesting interpretations of the patterns suggesting, among others, that Croats and Hungarians are more alike in preferring passive gambling metaphors (tickets and the lottery) to the more active card-playing and betting favored by English speakers. This, they argue, might be linguistic testament to differences in mentality, with Croats and Hungarians taking a more passive attitude to life than the audacious American.

The next chapter takes us to translation, the domain where issues of universality and variation find their most practical application in negotiating communication between languages and cultures. Rydnin''s paper *CTMM as a Method to Study Conceptual Metaphtonymies in Translation* is a sharp restatement of some of the fundamental truths about translation in the terms current in cognitive linguistics; e.g. "[M]eaning is not a property of words, but rather a property of the individual's ability *to construct a cognitive configuration*" (p. 297). This outlook relies on a new understanding of *translation equivalence*, a term long known to translation studies and contrastive linguistics. Here, it includes aspects of *conceptual* correspondences (found at different levels and to different degrees) which make utterances translationally equivalent even in the absence of (total/significant) lexical and/or grammatical correspondences. To show how theories of conceptual metaphor and metonymy (CTMM) contribute to a better understanding of translation equivalence, and of the strategies employed by translators faced with figurative data, the author analyzed 12 translations of contextu-

alized metaphtonymic utterances (English to Norwegian). The translations were compared for the degree of conceptual match to the original utterances. Evidence was found for differences at both metonymic and metaphorical levels (at different levels of source and target domains, in the number of metaphors and/or metonymies involved). Several types of translation strategies were proposed, ranging from using fully corresponding, or partially similar conceptual structures, to making creative leaps resulting in major conceptual shifts. Although the study is of a preliminary nature, it does bring to light interesting results and includes pointers to important theoretical and methodological questions for future research, such as the question of the boundaries of conceptual equivalence, etc.(p. 324). The paper is an excellent contribution to the cross-fertilization of cognitive linguistics and translation studies. The CTMM is argued to provide translation theorists with useful models of meaning representation. Translation, in turn, benefits cognitive semantics greatly: because translation deals both with comprehension and with *reformulation* of comprehension, it provides a window into the dynamics of conceptual variability which comes to light when figurative thought travels between languages and cultures.

"Angst" and "Fear"in Contrast: A Corpus-Based Analysis of Emotion Concepts belongs to a growing number of papers using corpus-based methods in lexical contrastive research (e.g. Altenberg and Granger 2002). Its reliance on corpus data as a starting point for the analysis of emotion concepts is methodologically superior to a top-down (concept-to-lexeme) perspective in capturing the variability in the conceptualization of FEAR in the two languages. Admittedly, focusing on one lexical item per language (and lists of their co-occurrences) could be considered limited since it does not allow us to draw conclusions about *the two conceptual systems* for FEAR. The field has a number of further conventional lexicalizations, e.g. *freight, dread, alarm/Angst, Schreck, Furcht, Schwachjerzigkeit* as well as phraseological, syntactic expressions (e.g. *I'm shaking in my boots, jemandem rutscht das Herz in die Hose*). Such an extended approach would, of course, complicate the analysis profoundly, but would yield even more robust results. Even still, this does not invalidate the contrastive findings presented. On the qualitative side, the author analyses data in terms of conceptual metaphors (where data are assessed using quantitative measures of productivity index and creativity ratio, capturing the *meaningful relations between* a metaphor's overall frequency and the number of different instantiating expressions); conceptual metonymies (which, perhaps expectedly, evidenced strong similarities), and two additional factors a) conceptual proximity (co-occurrence of words for FEAR with other emotion words) and b) evaluation/description. The

latter includes semantic preference (the semantic field a word's collocates belong to) and semantic prosody (pragmatic evaluation of these collocates in terms of positive or negative). The analysis brought out some strong similarities and interesting contrasts along these dimensions, which make the paper a valuable contribution to the growing body of research into variability/universality straddling the lexical and conceptual systems.

The last chapter in this section *Emotion meets motion: Estonian personality trait vocabulary motivated by embodied experience* opens with reports of some cross-disciplinary facts concerning the vocabulary of personality traits. It is claimed that the majority of lexical studies of personality traits has been done in psychology. However, the authors stipulate than neither psychological studies nor some earlier lexical studies in Estonian could explain which domains of common world knowledge are used in the process of conceptualizing and lexically expressing personality traits (p. 356). That is why they embark on a cognitive linguistic analysis of some personality traits from the perspective of the theory of conceptual metaphor and metonymy. The aim was to study where and how space and motion structure personality traits. Moreover, because psychologists consider both emotion and motivation important aspects of personality, this means also looking into how these spatial domains structure emotions. Despite a generally satisfactory description of much of the selected vocabulary (esp. that based on the PATH image schema), there are some methodological/technical and analytical issues which make certain claims/analyses somewhat puzzling. Mainly, the terms emotion and personality trait seem to be used too freely which makes it difficult to understand some subsequent (re)statements of the goal: "… and show where and how the spatiality of human cognition has been related to emotional experience in the case of conceptualizing personality" (p. 356) – it would appear that emotion is the primary focus of the study and that all personality traits involve emotion, but then cf. "The list of personality trait terms, related to emotion *or/and*[1] motion, (p. 377). Also, it is difficult to understand some proposed analyses. For example, it is argued that the Estonian word for 'hazardous' (*hasartne*) involves both motion and emotion concepts. I find the latter analysis not intuitively obvious; at best one could apply the blanket argument (p. 356), which postulates an etymological link between the words *motion*, *emotion* and *motivation* in Latin, and relate 'hazardous' to 'having the *courage* (emotion) and *motivation* to achieve a *goal'*. But does this make *hazardous* a metaphorical expression? Many lexical items involve motion only on a very 'deep' sublexical level, or involve different types of motion (translocational in *edasiviiv* 'construc-

[1] Emphasis is mine.

tive', lit. forward+carry+PRS.PTCP; and non-translocational as in *tõmblev* 'nervous' lit. twitch+PRS.PTCT). Finally, perhaps a more careful statement of the goal/advantages of the study presented would preclude an unwarranted and arguably overly ambitious expectation that the study would explain which aspects of the common world knowledge structure personality traits; 14% of the 1200 lexical items initially elicited from informants have been handpicked, metaphorically speaking, to account for a fragment of those that lend themselves to a cognitive semantic explanation. These issues aside, the main merit of this contribution is in providing the reader with some interesting non-English data, and in taking cognitive linguistics to those areas of lexical organization that seem to have been underexplored.

3.4. Section 4: Diachronic Studies

This section opens with Raffaelli's paper *The conceptual category of* light *in Croatian: A diachronic perspective.* The author presents an approach to the diachronic study of lexical fields which is at the same time well-suited to account for the lexical development of synthetic languages such as Croatian (a debt, duly acknowledged, to Guirauld's theory of morphosemantic fields (1967)), and capable of embracing the benefits of a CL approach to meaning. As for the former advantage, the author argues that in addition to paradigmatic links between typically parasynonymous lexemes of the same word class (e.g. in Trier 1931), there are important links to account for between so-called *base lexemes* (lexeme(s) attested first in Croatian usage, unmotivated words as the basis of all other derived forms) and their morphosemantic counterparts across word classes. It makes little sense, the argument goes, to study the lexical structuring of the conceptual category LIGHT (and its extensions to abstract domains) by focusing only on e.g. the nouns such as *sjaj* ('shine'), *vid* ('sight'). These have semantically and grammatically related verbs *sjajiti* ('to shine'), *vidjeti* ('to see') and adjectives *sjajan* ('shiny'), *vidan/vidljiv* ('visible'), which often exhibit diverging paths of semantic development, with some member(s) of the derivational pair/cluster often remaining true to the concrete basic sense (e.g. *sjaj*N ('shine'), other(s) departing completely into abstract domains through metaphorical extension and specialization (*sjajnoAdj!* ('excellent')). This would make it theoretically possible to get opposite semantic analyses of the same conceptual category (plus metaphorically related conceptual categories) depending on which word class is chosen for the analysis. Secondly, focusing on some prominent conceptual metaphors in this field, i.e. UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING, EXCELLENCE IS LIGHT,

and RESPECT IS LIGHT, the author also showed their systematic effects in the conceptual field(s) studied across the chosen lexical items and classes. This chapter displays interesting descriptive data on the morphosemantic fields of five selected (pairs of) base lexemes. But it also contributes to the volume's general aim; first, by advertising the marriage of cognitive lexicology and diachrony (at the time when scholars are also addressing, and more critically reassessing this interplay in fields such as grammaticalization theory i.e. Croft (2003), Traugott and Dasher (2002), cf. Evans and Green 2006); and second, by integrating Guiraud's theory of morphosemantic fields into the CL framework, effectively building a bridge to a theory outside the CL which can help the latter reach out towards languages structurally different from English.

The volume closes with Ch. Shank's *The Grammaticalization of the Verb 'Realize': A Diachronic Corpus-Based Study*. This is a corpus-based study of the diachronic development and grammaticalization of the mental state predicate (MSP) *realize* and its historically variable (non-) use of the complementizer *that*. This research is interpreted against the results of earlier studies into the grammaticalization of the prototypical and more frequent MSP *think* and its (attendant) use, in particular Pronoun+verb sequences, as an expression of epistemic probability ('epistemic parenthetical or EPAR)'. Typical explanations run along these lines: there is a correlation between the use of the zero-complementizer and the agent's epistemic claims regarding the truth of the proposition expressed in the predicate: the use of zero should indicate the speaker's stronger epistemic commitment to the 'truth' of predicate (Dor 2005). Moreover, the use of the zero-complementizer is interpreted as meaning greater prominence of the embedded clause than the matrix (Kearns 2007). This shift is marked by the lack of the overt signal of subordination and decategorialization (e.g. Thompson and Mulac 1991), meaning that the original matrix clause has become a parenthetical disjunct – an EPAR. Cf. 1). *Satire,* ***he thinks****, you ought not expect;* 2) *This has not been much of a debate,* ***I realize****.*

Failing to find statistical support for the four structural patterns traditionally invoked as the 'conditioning factors' for the preference of zero- over *that*–complementizer with *think*, the author set out to explore the a) diachronic development and grammaticalization of *think* and *realize* b) along with the (non)use of zero-complementizer and c) the attendant blurring of the main - complement clause distinction through loss of *that*, which arguably paves the way for the rise of EPARs. The analysis has shown that over time the use of both verbs as EPARs has increased (to varying degrees). This means a corresponding shift in

frequency towards 1st person and present tense usage (typical of EPARs) and increase of the use of zero-complementizer. However, although this generally applies to both MSPs, the verb *think* is far more advanced in this development. The patterns for *realize* suggest that the verb is grammaticalizing, however, it seems to be at a much earlier stage, since the ratio of *that vs* zero, though pushing towards zero, is still in favor of *that* (64% vs 36%). Evidence of its use as an EPAR can be found from the 20th century forward, but the verb has yet to develop, in statistically significant terms, other features of parentheticals, such as the shift to 1st person and present tense. The author concludes by interpreting his findings in the light of a Construction Grammar model, arguing it may provide the best explanatory approach for the patterns attested in his database.

4. Concluding remarks

On balance, *Cognitive Linguistics between Universality and Variation* is an inspiring volume dedicated to exploring the many faces of universality and variation in Cognitive Linguistics. Different chapters address different ends and aspects of this spectrum, both ideologically and methodologically, and in doing so they all do their share in contributing to the volume's main mission. The book can be recommended for the following reasons:

- the editorial mission statement laid out in the introduction provides an excellent platform from which readers can appreciate and assess not only the chapters included, but also CL as a whole;
- the volume features a diverse and reasonably well-balanced assortment of topics and approaches, which may appeal to those members of the CL community (and potential new recruits) who want to appreciate the extent, and growth of CL towards new territories;
- it highlights places where CL is reaching out towards other compatible frameworks (e.g. functional syntax or theory of morphosemantic fields) and interdisciplinary fields (e.g. psycholinguistics) to seek vindication for its claims and invite constructive cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary dialogue.

References

Altenberg, Bengt, Sylviane Granger, eds. (2002). *Lexis in Contrast. Corpus-Based Approaches*. (Studies in Corpus Linguistics 7). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Buck, Rosemary (1997). Words that are their opposites: noun to verb conversion in English. *Word* 48: 1–14.

Croft, William (2003). *Typology and universals*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, Vyvyan, Melanie Green (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda L. Thornburg (2000). The effect for cause metonymy in English grammar. Barcelona, Antonio, ed. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 215–231.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda L. Thornburg, eds. (2003). *Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing* (Pragmatics and Beyond, New Series 113). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Semino, Elena (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse.* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, John (1996). On running and jogging. *Cognitive Linguistics* 7.1: 21–34.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, Richard Dasher (2002) *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.