



COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC STUDIES: A GLOBAL DIVERSITY

Iryna Shevchenko, Dr., Prof. (Kharkiv)

Last summer, Ukrainian linguists from Kharkiv, Kyiv, Cherkassy participated in the International Cognitive Linguistics Conference “Linguistic Diversity and Cognitive Linguistics” (ICLC-14, 1–14 July 2017, Tartu, Estonia). This event was organized by the International Cognitive Linguistics Association together with the Estonian Cognitive Linguistics Association and supported by the University of Tartu ASTRA PER ASPERA Project and the Centre of Excellence in Estonian Studies (European Union, European Regional Development Fund). In July, Tartu – a famous center of science and education, welcomed as many as 480 delegates from 50 countries all around the world. The organizers managed to combine a most invigorating academic program with the cultural and social program. It gave participants the chance to relax and enjoy a combination of various events that took place in the University and the Estonian National Museum rich in Estonian and Finno-Ugric history and culture.

The ICLC-14 Conference gave the floor for most interesting **plenary lectures** (presented online, too) by Ronald W. Langacker “Functions and assemblies”, Dagmar Divjak “Prime time for the language sciences: between linguistics and psychology (with a pinch of engineering)”, Nick C. Ellis “Usage-based approaches to language, language acquisition, and language processing”, Laura A. Janda “Aspects of aspect”, Asifa Majid “The senses at the intersection of language, culture, and biology”, John Newman “EAT, DRINK, MAN, WOMAN and all that: The linguistics of ordinary human experience”.

R.W. Langacker (Research Professor at the University of California, San Diego, USA) stated that “structure vs. function is just a matter of perspective, given that the former resides in patterns of activity

and the latter in tasks to be accomplished <...>. As viewed in Cognitive Grammar (CG), a language comprises a vast assembly of structures (functional groupings) that often cross-cut one another. Numerous phenomena often treated separately are seen instead as representing different facets of this assembly: meaning and grammar; constituency and dependency; syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations; categorization; systems of opposing elements; lexicon, morphology, syntax, and discourse <...>. Meaning and grammar represent an indissociable mixture of affective, interactive, descriptive, and discursive functions <...>. Consisting in activity, language structure is inherently dynamic, unfolding in processing windows on different time scales. The order of expressions defines just one path of access to assemblies, and the sequence of access, along that and other paths, is an essential aspect of semantic and grammatical structure. Based on CG assemblies, a unified account can thus be envisaged of structure, function, processing, and use, as well as the various levels and dimensions of linguistic organization” [1, p. 31].

Professor Nick C. Ellis from the University of Michigan spoke about the usage-based approaches from the point of view of corpus linguistics. He argued that “Cognitive Linguistics and Psycholinguistics are concerned with how people acquire, represent, and process this knowledge” and described 1) Usage, 2) Usage in Learning (Child language acquisition), 3) Usage in Mind: L1 knowledge, 4) Usage in Mind: L2 knowledge [1, p. 26].

Among the **theme sessions** there were “Time and Viewpoint in Narrative Discourse”, “The diversity of irony”, “Artifacts and joint attention”, “Constructions at the mid-level of abstraction: linguistic diversity,

variation and context”, “Constructing emotional events”, “Participatory sensemaking, socio-cultural embodiment, and linguistic practice”, “Reference and cognition”, “Specificity and schematicity in gestures and in signed languages” and others. Most of them proved to be corpus-based researches of various languages (not only English or other European tongues).

Ukrainian linguists presented their research at various theme sessions. Prof. I.V. Bondarenko (V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine) addressed the issue of cognitive modelling of manipulation in information warfare. She argued that “Current conflicts in the world often have hybrid nature, i.e. combination of conventional armed force actions with political or information warfare in the media and cyber space”. Achieving these conflicts’ objectives requires non trivial approaches, among which one often chooses psychological manipulation, i.e. social influence that aims to change the behavior or perception of others through abusive, deceptive or underhanded tactics. Analogue and digital mass media, Web 2.0. and 3.0 inclusive, with their great potential of manipulation of target audiences serve a tool of such social influence. “Hypothetically, manipulation misbalances this immanently holistic cognitive structure by way of substituting domains in its matrices and/or transforming their relations. As a result, the emergent construal of the world preserves the initial nomenclature of matrices (or lexical concepts they profile), but their value and relationships turn so distorted that their very essence may change to the opposite” [1, p. 199]. Her case study of such Internet memes as #Ukraine, #Russia, #Maidan and #Antimaidan revealed the following cognitive stages of manipulation: “1) detection of the most vulnerable domain matrix in the construal of the object of manipulation; 2) substitution of a domain or relations of domains in the matrix; 3) adjusting the emergent structure to the whole construal for maintaining its balance” [1, p. 200].

The research of conceptual metaphors in public speeches of Barack Obama and Vladimir Putin by prof. Svitlana Zhabotynska (Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Ukraine) and Oleksandr Shvets (Carleton University, Canada) proposes a framework for analyzing conceptual metaphors tracked in large bulks of linguistic metaphorical expressions (LME) used in a thematically coherent discourse. The

theoretical apparatus includes basic notions of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (target and source domains, cross-mapping, metaphorical entailments, range and scope of metaphor. Prof. Zhabotynska employed these notions for a pilot study of conceptual metaphors signifying POLITICS, ECONOMY, and AMERICA / RUSSIA target conceptual domains in the public speeches delivered in 2014 – 2015 by the two leaders. The data exhibit considerable differences and the study demonstrates how conceptual metaphors make use of the deeply entrenched ideas important for the survival of humans (those of home, moving on the road, fighting, etc.) for construing ideologies represented in the opposite worldviews [1, p. 534].

Prof. Alla Martyniuk (V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine) focused on Ukrainian mappings of English container metaphors of emotional states. She aimed at comparing English and Ukrainian CONTAINER metaphors of emotional states in search of similarities and/or differences with a special focus on their translations. Methodologically her study rests on the Conceptual Integration Theory (Fauconnier, Turner) that accounts for the dynamic aspects of meaning construction involving the emergence of novel inferences. As the study shows, in English fiction EMOTIONAL STATES, mapped in terms of the CONTAINER image schema, are conceived either as INTERIORS of CONTAINERS EXPERIENCERS. The study also proved that the loss/substitution does not influence the quality of translation [1, p. 369].

Prof. Galina Yavorska (National Institute for Strategic Studies, Ukraine) addressed the concept of WAR in Ukrainian public discourse. Using the cognitive-linguistic approaches she argued that the perception of WAR depended on some recurrent conceptual metaphors that govern our thoughts and functioning. She explored the characteristics of the verbal representation of war in Ukrainian media texts and networks (2014 – 2016) along with their dynamics on the background of previous conceptual scheme and specifically the perception of the WWII as the most prototypical representative of the category. There prove to be “fundamental contradictions in the representation and understanding of the Russian aggression against Ukraine in the media”. The public debate in Ukraine is focusing on the opposition of ‘real war’ (*declared war*) and ATO (*undeclared war*).

“The perception of WWII as the prototype is gradually coming into disuse and the current armed conflict moves to the center of the conceptual category (the word collocation *before the war* earlier meant ‘before WWII’ mostly refers now to the events before the spring of the 2014)” [1, p. 528].

Prof. Iryna Shevchenko (V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine) in her presentation “The evolution of English expressions of modest behaviour: pragmatic-cognitive analysis” (a poster session) addressed mental issues of interactional styles and their diachronic variation. Using cognitive, pragmatic and discourse analyses as the analytic approaches she focuses on cognitive-communicative properties of the modest communicative behaviour in terms of concepts-properties. She revealed the lexical-semantic properties of the concept’s name modest and its synonyms; the categorial characteristics of MODESTY in the English worldview; modelled the concept’s cognitive schemata for various historical periods; described the range of its cognitive metaphors; analyzed its discourse realization through politeness strategies and finally proved that the ethnocultural stereotype MODESTY has dynamic historically gradual cognitive and pragmatic features which vary in terms of anagenesis revealing the change of vectors from evolution in the 14th–19th centuries to involution in 20th–21st century discourse [1, p. 576].

One cannot describe all interesting reports and presentations at the Congress so I will mention some which most attracted my attention. In the theme session “The Diversity of Irony”, John Barnden (University of Birmingham, UK) unified three accounts of irony: the author’s pretence-based account of irony, including certain complex forms of hyperbole within irony; his pretence-based approach to metaphor and a recent approach to hyperbole by Ruiz de Mendoza.

In the same session, Dirk Gaerartes (University of Leuven) addressed second order empathy and irony and systematized the interplay of hearer’s first order and second order beliefs as yielding six basic interpretative possibilities: statement, deception, disagreement, confirmation, accommodation, irony.

Prof. Jordan Zlatev (Lund University, Centre for Languages and Linguistics, Division for Cognitive Semiotics) discussed perceptual intersubjectivity and the grounding of demonstratives. He argued that the

meaning of different linguistic expressions is grounded in pre-linguistic structures of embodied intersubjectivity, such as the dual nature of the living body (as “internally” felt and “externally” observed) and the intersubjective nature of object perception. At the same time, he emphasized that such intercorporeal experiences should not be conflated with the symbolic and normative linguistic meanings that are sedimented upon them. His special focus was on “a class of expressions that are particularly applicable to such an analysis, as they are more clearly than any other on the “border” between pre-linguistic and linguistic intersubjectivity: spatial demonstratives like *this/that* and *here/there*”. Using the notion of perceptual intersubjectivity Zlatev shows that demonstratives are on the one hand transparently grounded in perceptual and non-symbolic processes in the sense of phenomenology, and on the other are used “to ground the meaning of content words”. So “demonstratives link the two different ways in which the notion of grounding is used in the cognitive linguistic literature: on the one hand they are grounded in pre-linguistic embodied intersubjectivity, and on the other hand they fulfil the function of contextually grounding the shared symbolic representations (construals) inherent in content words” [1, p. 101].

In the theme session “Constructing Emotional Events” prof. Zoltán Kövecses (School of English and American Studies Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest) discussed the online construction of emotion metaphors and offered a new theoretical argument for the online production of emotion metaphors: “(1) the contextualist version of conceptual metaphor theory CMT and (2) the recently developed “layered view” of CMT”. Kövecses argued that “context-sensitive CMT is based on the idea that four context types playing a major role in actual, online metaphor construction: situational context, discourse context, cognitive-conceptual context, and bodily context”. In a multi-level view of CMT, metaphors can be found on several distinct levels: from the bottom level (“the level of mental spaces, or scenarios”) to the higher level of frames, domains and image-schemas (the highest) [1, p. 54].

In the same session prof. Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (State University of Applied Sciences in Konin & University of Lodz) discussed the English and Polish emotion dynamics in online conflict

construal. She argued that emotions are manifested both as the bodily and mental reactions and can be expressed in terms of a number of meaningful linguistic markers. Her research showed significant differences between English and Polish with regard to the degree and salience of emotions displayed in CMC. Her research addressed the problem of the construction of an online Conflict Event in the discourse of refugees and methodology combined a discourse-based corpus-assisted Cognitive Linguistics approach [1, p. 55].

Prof. Suzanne Kemmer (Rice University, USA) focused on the study of fictive motion (FM) pioneered by Leonard Talmy. In her study she performed a conceptual blending analysis of the data from a large corpus to describe conceptual processes in the fictive motion of spatial description. A set of recurrent types of fictive movers displayed some conceptual overlap, but also organization around category prototypes: “These include path objects (*road, trail*); quasi-linear landscape objects (*cliff, valley, gorge*); flowing streams, which have properties of both paths and linear landscape objects, but also unique properties, e.g. having both factive and fictive motion (*river, creek*); border objects (*fence, wall*); tall structures (*tower, temple*); areal expanses (*field, plain*), and a few minor object types”. S. Kemmer analysed each of these object types in terms of its special characteristics, topological, functional, or both, that make it amenable to FM construals. Her examples of blended construals showed how FM can involve complex integrations of multiple domains of experience. “The results further extend our understanding of fictive motion and how it functions in communication” [1, p. 318].

In the General Session, Antonio Barcelona (University of Córdoba, Spain) discussed “interstate names” as a highly conventional way of naming interstate and other highways in American English: e.g. *Interstate 66* or *Highway 99*. His detailed description of two seldom studied constructions serves further

evidence of the advantages of a constructional approach to grammar and of the role of formal metonymy in ellipsis [1, p. 176].

Günter Radden (Hamburg University) focused on how cognitive-linguistic insights can be applied to foreign language teaching and learning. He argued that grammar is symbolic and no less meaningful than lexical items. He presented a workbook entitled “Meaningful English Grammar” and proved it to be particularly appropriate in motivating and understanding the structure of a foreign language. (The book follows the structure of the widely used Cognitive English Grammar by Radden & Dirven (2007) and may be used as a supplementary workbook with rich and authentic study [1, p. 429].

To sum up, the Conference supplied a brilliant atmosphere for the exchange of ideas on cognitive linguistics worldwide. It helped find better understanding between Ukrainian and foreign linguists. Ronald Langacker and Suzanne Kemmer were interested in Ukrainian studies and gave their consent to act as consulting editors for our scholarly on-line journal “Cognition, communication, discourse” (<http://sites.google.com/site/cognitiondiscourse>). I am sure the ICLC-14 Conference proved most valuable and fruitful for the further development of cognitive linguistic research in Ukraine.

LITERATURE

1. International Cognitive Linguistics Conference: Linguistic Diversity and Cognitive Linguistics (10–14 July 2017, Tartu, Estonia). Book of abstracts. – Tartu, 2017. – 588 p.

REFERENCES

Vainik, E., and Sahkai, H. (eds.). (2017). *International Cognitive Linguistics Conference: Linguistic Diversity and Cognitive Linguistics (10–14 July 2017, Tartu, Estonia). Book of abstracts*. Tartu.