
Tanja Gradečak-Erdeljić
University of Osijek
Faculty of Education

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara & Kamila Turewicz, eds. 2002.
Cognitive Linguistics Today. Łódź Studies in Language. Frankfurt am
Main: Peter Lang.

Being now the leading movement in the field of linguistics, cognitive theory has proved able to cover various facets of human life, such as literature, culture studies, language education, lexicography and many others. The present volume offers a further valuable contribution to an attempt to present the current achievements in the application of cognitive theory in practice. It is a collection of papers presented at the first international cognitive linguistics conference in Poland, held at the Faculty of Philology of the University of Łódź on 19-23 April 2001, or rather a selection of papers from general sessions and with the participation of some invited plenary speakers.

As the organizers of the conference and the the editors of these proceedings point out, the overall themes of the conference were interdisciplinarity, applicability and research methodology in Cognitive Linguistics. The volume duly reflects these guidelines, so that it comprises the following major parts: *Theory and Method*, *Figures of Thought*, *Cognition and Pragmatics*, *Case Studies* and *Applied Studies*. This division into rather neutral but informative headings furnishes the reader with a roadmap to navigate his/her way through a considerate body of literature (clocking in at approximately 700 pages and presenting no less than 42 papers, this volume can boast to be a huge body indeed), with diverse theoretical concerns and approaches, and authors with the whole gamut of scholarly backgrounds and affiliations, the latter including scholars from Poland, Ukraine, Russia, Croatia, Hungary, France, Germany, Sweden, Spain and the United States. This, too, gives an idea of how demanding a task was the enterprise of editing such a varied host of authors and their ideas, and this is why Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Kamila Turewicz both deserve praise.

Given the limited length of this review, in what follows I will concentrate on the articles which seem to me to identify some overarching themes of this collection or which I find particularly worthy of highlighting.

The first part, *Theory and Method*, which deals with theoretical and methodological questions prompted by the cognitive approach to linguistic issues, is opened by a Ronald W. Langacker's article *Theory, method, and description in cognitive grammar: A case study*. This invaluable contribution by the

founder of Cognitive Grammar presents another insightful overview of the possibilities this theory can offer to a scholar truly interested in this subfield of Cognitive Linguistics, by reintroducing some well known points of reference like PROFILING and TRAJECTOR/LANDMARK ORGANIZATION of a linguistic expression. What Langacker sets as a main focus of this paper is to explain his PRIMARY WORKING STRATEGY in applying CG, i.e. what are the descriptive constructs which make it operative. The underlying evidence for these constructs should have its sources in the necessity for the particular construct to be able to describe, in semantic terms, multiple phenomena in various languages, it must be linked to certain observable cognitive ability, and it must be relevant in explaining various grammatical phenomena. Langacker follows these prerequisites in the sense that he applies several of his descriptive constructs in his case study of English and Mixtec locatives where he opposes the descriptive construct of setting or location vs. participant. Whereas English uses prepositional phrases as typical locative elements, Mixtec, an Otoman-guean language spoken in Mexico, possesses nothing similar to the word class of prepositions and instead makes use of, most frequently nominal, compounds involving body-part terms. The common point of reference in both linguistic tools is the SEARCH DOMAIN, or “the region to which a locative expression confines its trajectory” (p. 25). The search domain would thus be the vicinity of the most salient landmark located in the process of looking for something. Mixtec examples show an amazing interplay of the metaphoric and metonymic forces influencing the choice of the landmark: the metaphoric extension of the element ‘head_tree’ (‘at the top of the tree/over the tree/on the tree’) and its metonymic reference to the adjacent regions in space create a characteristic locative expression, when the location becomes a referent instead of the participant previously construed as body representing a reference object. The author shows later on that English, diachronically speaking, developed some of its prepositional forms from nouns denoting body parts (*ahead of, behind etc.*) and as a further argument stresses the fact that the difference between a preposition and a locational or relational noun becomes relevant only when there obtains a shift of the profile, since, otherwise, locational nouns have all the properties of a preposition: a reference object, a region in space in relation to it and something that occupies that region. With this example Langacker managed to support his initial motivation for developing his working strategy: it is relevant in the sense of the use certain descriptive constructs may have in the typological study; these constructs are based on psychologically and linguistically well motivated evidence; it provides the systematic explanation of the grammaticalisation process of the locatives.

In another interesting paper from this section, *Polysemy: Mechanism and research methodology*, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk provides an outstanding overview of the treatment polysemy has received in the scope of Cognitive Linguistics as opposed to some, more traditional approaches. This

approach dictates the erasing of the “crisp boundaries between the lexicon and syntax and between semantics and pragmatics”, one of the foundations of the cognitive approach to language. The source for the so called *multisemy cline* formed by homonymy, polysemy and vagueness are various radial categories which cater for different cognitive domains governing the typology of polysemy. The author then accounts for specific subsenses within this typology, distinguishing between regular polysemy or ALLOSEMY when different segments of the concept are profiled (*door* with a reference to the surface of the object, the whole object, or the lock only) and polysemy in a single domain, which, furthermore subsumes metonymy, synecdoche and antonymous polysemy. She then goes on to describe rather rare examples of antonymous polysemy which presents diachronically connected, but lexically divergent senses of a linguistic unit. The examples she uses are taken from English and Polish, showing that various languages make use of the same cognitive system of different linguistic profiling and construal of the outside world. The further subcategories of polysemy are RADIAL POLYSEMY and CROSS-DOMAIN POLYSEMY which involve each other, as well as certain metaphonymic extensions and the processes of cognitive blending. The methodological approach she proposes is an eclectic one, following Newman’s observation that Cognitive Linguistics in general cannot boast to have a unique methodology. It should be our goal to rely on the variety of information ensuing from various scientific fields, e.g. psychology, dialectology, historical linguistics. In sum, this quite informative piece of work whets our appetite for the forthcoming *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by D. Geeraerts and H. Cuyckens, where we should hopefully find an even more extensive account by the same author of the polysemy as a very intriguing linguistic structure.

It is the second part of the volume, the part dealing with “figures of thought”, as the editors put it wittily, that I consider probably the most interesting part of the book, since all the papers included are highly relevant and based on real-life evidence. Apart from Wengorek-Dolecka (*The discordant schema: On interpreting irony*), who studies ironic utterances in the light of Fauconnier’s *mental spaces* and claims that irony is far from being just a rhetorical figure but is a full-fledged cognitive category undergoing on-line modifications of the cognitive domains involved in the discourse, all other papers deal with either metaphor or metonymy.

This section on figures of speech gets off to a flying start with Kövecses’s article *Language, emotion, mind*, where he offers an extensive overview of the metaphoric and metonymic basis of the language of emotion, morality and rational thought. The novelty of his approach to these, according to the author ubiquitous subjects, is his introduction of the force-dynamics theory, originally proposed by Lenard Talmy, in the process of describing the metaphoric conceptualization of the three above mentioned linguistic and conceptual do-

mains. Kövecses's constant search for an underlying metaphor for emotion as a target domain has found its answer in *force* being the typical source domain (Kövecses, 2000). He found, however, that the same source domain can be valid for morality and rational thought as well, and the connection can be traced to Lakoff's Event Structure metaphor which states that CAUSES ARE FORCES. If we assume that i. causes lead to emotion, and ii. emotion leads to some response, we can immediately spot the elements of the Event Structure metaphor. In addition, taking into account the notions of the force-dynamics theory, the author introduces the elements of an AGONIST and ANTAGONIST as force entities playing the major role in the conceptualization of the target and source domains and the element of the RESULTANT OF THE FORCE INTERACTION as a final scenario of the metaphor. These elements become evident in all the variants of the emotion metaphor: EMOTION IS AN OPPONENT/A NATURAL FORCE/A PHYSIOLOGICAL FORCE/A PHYSICAL FORCE.

What comes up as an interesting result is that in the other two target domains we find the roles of an agonist and antagonist distributed differently with regard to the resultant action: in the emotion metaphor the rational 'self-agonist' undergoes change, in the morality metaphor the rational 'self-agonist' withstands the change, and in the thought metaphor we shall find the 'self-antagonist' causing the change in thought.

Tomasz P. Krzeszowski considers the theory of metaphor in the light of the issue of the directionality of the metaphoric mapping and the function of the verbal and non-verbal expressions of the source domain in a metaphoric concept. He creates a mirror image of metaphor and studies the realization of the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor through verbal and non-verbal means as described in *Pan Tadeusz*, the Polish national epic by Adam Mickiewicz and its film version by Andrzej Wajda. The scope of the properties of this metaphor in this poetic model stretches from the written argument to physical fight, with the corresponding increase in the number of referents to the above metaphor. He concludes his study arguing for the inseparability of the verbal and non-verbal aspects of human communication.

In the article by Rita Brdar-Szabó and Mario Brdar *MANNER-FOR-ACTIVITY metonymy in a cross-linguistic perspective*, the reader will discern the importance of cross-linguistic study of metonymy and metaphor. On the example of the above mentioned metonymy with predicatively used adjectives in the scope of a linguistic action, they show that there is a striking contrast between English and some other Indoeuropean languages (German, Croatian, Russian, Hungarian) concerning the frequency of their usage. A contrastive analysis of an abundance of data makes it possible to extract some interesting conclusions: that the four languages share the feature of paraphrasing the English predicative adjectives with the target verbs of linguistic action, or addition-

ally, cognitive action and behaviour and that, in their case, the active zone subsuming the metonymic extension of predicative adjectives shows a tendency of being specified by an adverbial clause, rather than by prepositional or postpositional phrases, the former being characteristic of English.

This article, with some other in this volume dealing with cross-linguistic issues (Janda's, Pskit's) shows a growing importance of comparing different linguistic systems within the framework of cognitive linguistic. This approach, although seemingly of interest mainly to European cognitivists, would provide the perspective of the cognitive undertow which has been directing the linguistic expression in various directions, as shown by the above article as well.

Antonio Barcelona's article *On the ubiquity and multiple-level operation of metonymy* can be commended for clearly organizing different developmental strands in the field of metonymy, especially in connection to various attempts of many cognitivists to relate it to other cognitive mechanisms, such as metaphor and conceptual blending. Barcelona puts metonymy decidedly in the foreground of all cognitive research, opting to characterize it as the process of: "mapping, within the same overall cognitive domain, of a cognitive (sub)domain, called the source, onto another cognitive (sub)domain, called the target, so that the latter is mentally activated" (p. 208).

He attempts to show how metonymy pervades all fields of linguistic study and how layers of metonymic mappings can be revealed in all traditional levels of linguistic analysis, including lexicology, phonology and grammar. He also promotes its central function in categorization, i.e. in the organization of a category in terms of subcategories, but goes on to relate it to propositional models and some non-linguistic aspects of human communication, such as the iconicity of some conventional symbols and gestures, as well as to its pragmatic role in descriptive discourse where an aspect of an event described evokes metonymically its whole scenario.

Further interesting points are made with reference to the phonological scope of the metonymy investigation, where e.g. certain allophones trigger the recognition and use of another allophone of the same phoneme, and the connection between metonymy and grammar is described on examples of Langacker's *active zone metonymies*, where an element of the clause can be interpreted metonymically as a reference point for an active zone, e.g. relational predicate, so that the verb *begin* in the following example:

Zelda began a novel.

would imply different possibilities of interpretation within the NP active zone *a novel*: 'write/read a novel'. Barcelona finds metonymy especially prominent in the process of noun to verb conversion, and later on, in its use in paragon names as further evidence of grammatical recategorization.

Barcelona's paper is a showcase of insistence on the key-role of metonymy in different cognitive processes and proves an invaluable contribution to supporting Langacker's idea of the continuum between different aspects of language and cognition and language itself.

The papers in the section *Cognition and Pragmatics* is, in my personal opinion, are only tangentially connected to cognitive theory in general. The pragmatists may seem interested in the cognitive processes of the spoken discourse for example, but what they mostly do is to connect the linguistic level to the psychological grounding of an utterance.

Jef Verschueren points out in his paper *Pragmatic aspects of culture and cognition* that he will concentrate on the "profoundly pragmatic" aspect of culturally instigated (in)equality of people at the expense of the *culture-cognition nexus*, as he calls it, and presents four case studies of human interaction influenced by different cultural (pre)conceptions.

After presenting a short historical overview of how social plurality has been treated in different cultural environments, Verschueren concentrates on the race issue in the present U.S.A. Basing his belief on four different stories of people with different racial and national backgrounds, he claims that people are still far away from accepting the theory that an individual has multiple identities. Sooner or later, he or she becomes defined by a particular subset of this multiple identity (race, nationality, sex etc.), which further influences mutual interaction and the conception of others.

Another pragmatic account, offered by Piotr Cap in his article *Cognitive psychology and linguistic politeness: an interactional model of political rhetoric analysis*, concentrates on the novel feature of discourse analysis theory, namely, of linguistic politeness which is exemplified by a detailed study of 'NATO language' as used by some NATO politicians during the conflict in Kosovo in 1999. His introduction is dedicated to different theories of politeness, as presented in Leech's model of discourse maxims and Brown and Levinson's 'face-threatening acts' (or FTA) theory. He then uses both theories in explaining the psychological background of processing extralinguistic findings into linguistic concepts, referring particularly to the concept of psychological consistency as opposed to linguistic ambivalence and optionality.

In Part, 4 which deals with various case studies in particular languages, but also in a crosslinguistic perspective, there are many interesting studies on how cognitive theories may be applied and subsequently revised/refined in a particularized and controlled environment of specific linguistic units.

In the case of Laura Janda's *The case for competing conceptual systems*, the title in fact half hides the topic of her paper, namely, the analysis of the case system of Slavic languages, Czech, Polish and Russian. After providing a semantic basis for the meaning of a particular case, she goes on to provide an exhaustive list of metaphoric extensions of every particular case meaning. This list will serve as a basis of comparison of the above three languages which should prove that there is a fairly systematic motivation for the specific distribution of the case usage. Janda points out that in the case system of Slavic there is no "one-to-one mapping of perceptual input and case use" (p. 360), but that the evident variation in use should be compared to choreography where the same steps (cases) and the same music (case semantics) are organized by different choreographers (linguistic communities) into different dances (case constructions). This beautiful and potentially universal analogy is later on supported by her detailed study of the three languages in their use of particular cases and the cognitive strategies the speakers use while activating a particular case form of a NP. She proposes three important types of variation in case usage: in their range and strength, their usage in construal and syntax, and in particular discrete case contrasts. As a result, it might be concluded that we can talk here about geographical dialectology of the case semantics, since there is a tendency for Czech and Polish to group at one side of the case distribution scale, whereas Russian shows a persistent tendency of offering alternative ways of case semantic expression. An additional point can be made in reference to the distribution of case contrasts: they seem to appear in small sets where these contrasts are realized in multiple instances, so that we have a wide range of overlapping cognitive categories.

Janda also provides a very interesting methodology in contrasting these three languages: in her tables we can find examples of these languages organized in clusters according to the cognitive strategies used as a justification for a particular case appearing in certain contexts. After that she offers these clusters particularized in tables with the English translation and the cases used in the original.

Although the internal organization of the paper is a bit perplexing (the tables with the original examples and the cognitive mechanisms are inserted in between the separate tables with case clusters), it nevertheless provides an excellent introduction to such a demanding area of Slavic linguistics as the Slavic case system (which is further supported by the Tabakowska's paper on the Polish instrumental later in this volume).

Further on in this section, Kamila Turewicz deals with the notion of futurity in the paper titled *What is future in the Future Simple Tense?* This excellent study of the constructs with *will* and *shall* starts off with the claim that these two modal verbs perform the function of ‘future auxiliaries’, as motivated by the Cognitive Grammar definition of modals as epistemic grounding predicates (Langacker 1987). If we put aside the claim that the sense of a tense must be connected to a synthetically modified simple verb form, Turewicz also maintains that the use of *will* and *shall* with the future time reference is motivated by their respective meaning schemas, or in other words, modal concepts, which additionally begs the question of the Future Simple Tense existing as such. The author claims that the modals acquire their modal meanings when used in sentences and not as modal verbs alone, and purports to exemplify that the underlying concept of these verbs is ‘future common prediction’, but this semantic burden of prediction or, in terms of *The Comprehensive Grammar of English* by Quirk et al., prediction and volition exempts them from the concept of tense as such.

After an exhaustive reference to the etymological and lexicological background of the lexemes *will* and *shall*, Turewicz provides the analysis of several examples which are to prove the epistemic grounding of these predications. She wraps it up by relating the nature of polysemy of these verbs to respective schemas defining the modal meanings.

In René Dirven’s paper *Recent cognitive approaches to English phrasal verbs* we are facing a complex and, in many senses, an extremely thorough picture of the latest findings in the cognitive study of English phrasal verbs. He draws on the recent studies by Tyler and Evans, Morgan, Hampe and Gries in order to show the new tendencies in the approach to these specific lexical units. Stressing the metaphorical character of Tyler and Evans’s, Morgan’s, and Hampe’s studies, Dirven then concentrates on the mainly syntactic approach Gries took in his study of transitive particle verbs. Accepting some of their findings and discussing some of the more debatable ones, Dirven stresses the need for “a fully integrated syntactic-semantic approach” (p. 484). It is, however, a pity that we are left without the reference to the theory of independent templates of purely idiomatic particle verbs and globally metaphorised particle verbs. The footnote containing the reference to this research is missing completely from this page.

The final, fifth section of this volume concludes with five applied studies of cognitive linguistic issues, two of them dealing with pedagogical application of the cognitive approach to grammar (Lapaire’s *Imaginative grammar* presents a project of applied cognitive grammar of English for non-native speakers - in this case, French junior high school students -, while Bod-

narkowa's paper deals with *The influence of cognitivism on the development of educational diagnosis*). Two other papers deal with neurocognitive issues in linguistics (Zaliwska-Okrutna), viz. in psychology (Ciepela), and finally the paper by Holmquist and Płuciennik discusses *Appearance markers*.

As for the technical execution of this volume, it can pass as overallly quite good, except for the Index of Terms where there are such completely misguiding entries as e.g. for *gender*: on none of 15 pages referred to could I trace the concept in question. What I found most curious was that on all the pages (except for the Langacker's paper) there was the word *sex* and/or words morphologically related to it, which leads me to the conclusion that the process of compiling the index was done by a software robot which must have confused the literal use of the word *sex* with the more appropriate grammatical sense of *gender*.

I could also notice a rather biased relationship towards the languages listed in the index: there is no link to e.g. Croatian, Hungarian, German, though these languages are discussed in some of the papers presented, but there is an abundance of pages quoted for e.g. English, which is quite unsurprising, but a bit vacuous, bearing in mind the number of papers dealing with this particular language.

As a conclusion, I might point out that an impressive picture emerges from the volume, although it is clear that organizing this huge number of papers with such a multitude of interests and performances into a meaningful whole was a very demanding task indeed. Apart from a few editorial and/or productional glitches that can be found in some of the present articles, the reader may rest assure that even these do little to detract from the benefits that can be reaped from this book.

References:

- Barcelona, A. (ed.) (2000). *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive-Perspective*. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, R.W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1. *Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R.W. (1990). *Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Cognitive Linguistics Research 1.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Günter Radden, eds. (1999). *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Human Cognitive Processing 4. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.