Grygiel, Marcin and Laura A. Janda. eds. 2011. *Slavic Linguistics in a Cognitive Framework*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford and Wien: Peter Lang.

Although in 2007 Divjak and Kochańska (2007) rightfully claimed that Slavic languages do have a lot to offer to Cognitive Linguistics (being "an ideal laboratory for a cognitive linguist"; Divjak and Kochańska 2007:4), opening up to the Cognitive Linguistic (henceforth: CL) community at large still seems slow and gradual. This is not to say that the Slavic CL community has not been active (see, e.g. the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Association website at: http://languages.uchicago.edu/scla/) or that individual authors have not been published (e.g. see recent works, such as Janda and Solovyey 2009 or Nesset and Janda 2010). However, it seems that there have not been sufficient joint efforts of Slavic cognitive linguists to publish edited volumes *in English* devoted to various aspects of cognitive linguistics, which would ensure greater visibility of Slavic CL in the general CL community, and the overall linguistic community.

The book under review is an attempt to do precisely this, and is a step in the right direction. It is entirely in English, has been published by a well–known publisher (ensuring good distribution), contains chapters written by linguists renowned outside the Slavic or CL area (Laura Janda, Stephen Dickey, Dagmar Divjak, Mirjam Fried, Mario Brdar, Rita Brdar–Szabó, to name a few), and deals with a variety of grammatical, semantic and applied issues. This means that a linguist not familiar with the CL framework or with Slavic languages should find at least something that would be of interest to him/her. In this sense, the wide scope is a considerable advantage. At the same time, it creates a problem, making it nearly impossible to provide a coherent rationale for unifying such a variety of papers and topics. Before we return to this discussion, let us have a look at what this variety includes.

The first (and the largest) section entitled *Cognitive approaches to grammar* contains eight papers, including the papers by the two editors. It opens with Janda's paper (*Completability and the Russian aspect*), which discusses completability as a parameter relevant to the Russian aspectual system. Completability is a semantic term which refers to situations – a completable situation prototypically leads to a result whereas a non–completable one does not. For example, in *Professor pišet stat'ju* 'The professor is writing an article', the described situation is completable. Janda provides various types of evidence for completability as a valid parameter for Russian: morphological evidence (e.g. the difference in marking between verbs denoting completable and non–completable situations), syntactic evidence (e.g. passivization of verbs denoting completable situations vs. the impossibility of non–completable ones

to passivize), and semantic evidence (e.g. completable perfectives instantiate peripheral aspects of metonymy). Completability has both practical advantages (e.g. in teaching Russian) and theoretical advantages (because of its scalarity which is in harmony with the cognitive linguistic view). Although the paper deals with a topic that has already been treated by the author in her cluster model, it is a very clear review of completability, illustrating the fact that CL can cover a lot of data using a relatively simple semantic notion. Perhaps more attention could have been devoted to contrasting completability with other analyses, which are mentioned but their discussion remains on a general level. Janda's deep insight is a guarantee of a fascinating discussion, and a more detailed analysis would be particularly interesting to an audience not familiar with Slavic studies or CL.

The second paper, *Subjectification and the Russian perfective* by Stephen Dickey, gives a subjectification analysis of the Russian perfective. The author claims that various types of Russian perfective verbs may be adequately dealt with within a Langackerian subjectification framework (e.g. Langacker 2006). Specifically, verbs with clearly present direct results (e.g. *napisat'$_{PF}$ stixotvorenie* 'write a poem') are least subjectified – the result of writing is objectively present in the immediate scope of the scene (it is a poem in the example above), and does not require the conceptualizer's involvement. Attenuation of the objective relationship occurs with non–prototypically resultative telic verbs in situations where their direct result points to an oblique result. For instance, in a situation where Ivan is told to sit down, the statement *Ivan sel$_{PF}$* 'Ivan sat down' refers to the direct result (the fact that Ivan is sitting) but also points to an oblique result (that Ivan obeyed the order). In this case the connection between the action and the oblique result is attenuated, and more clearly depends on the conceptualizer. Finally, *po*–delimitatives (such as *porabotat'* 'work a while') and intensive–resultatives (such as *otležat'sja* 'lie to the point where one returns to a normal state') are claimed to profile a schematic oblique result, which crucially depends on the conceptualizer: the result is either completely schematic (e.g. just the fact that some sort of (unspecified) action will follow in the case of *po*–delimitatives) or outside the subject's control (in the case of intensive–resultatives). Although this analysis reveals the author's vast knowledge of the subject, and coincides with his east–west aspect isogloss (Dickey 2000), theoretically there seems to be a problem with two different aspects of subjectification: one where there is attenuation of the objective relationship between the action and its result (in the case of telic perfectives and *po*–delimitatives), and one where the subject's control gets attenuated (in the case of intensive–resultatives). This is formally visible in the distinction between the former group which typically does not involve the middle marker –*sja* (cf. Kemmer 1993 for an overview of middle constructions) and the latter which does. This issue aside, the paper offers an analysis with great cross–Slavic potential, some of which the author explores in the last section. That is why it might be of interest to Slavic and non–Slavic scholars.

Divjak's paper *Predicting aspectual choice in modal constructions: a quest for the Holy Grail?* is an attempt to find out what predicts aspectual choice in

modal contexts. It is a usage–based study, and applies quantitative corpus–linguistic methodology to the age–old question of whether perfective or imperfective aspect is used in deontic/epistemic contexts. Based on data from Russian, Polish, and BCS, Divjak finds that modality does indeed predict aspectual choice, but in a more detailed study of Polish finds that it is outperformed by the specificity/generality of situation. In this way, Divjak shows in practice the connection between the imperfective aspect and deontic modality (both being general in nature), and the perfective aspect and dynamic modality (both being specific in nature). This study embodies the most important advantages of CL: it is usage–based and corpus–based, uses empirical methods and provides semantically based generalizations. Because of this and its clear style (as well as not a too heavy reliance on theoretical issues) it may be of interest to Slavic linguists (with and without a CL background) and to cognitive linguists in general.

The following paper in this section, *Cognitive morphology and the architecture of case in Slovak* by Christoph Rosenbaum and Wolfgang Schulze, deals with case marking in Slovak within the framework of Cognitive Morphology. It is an account of the Slovak case morphology, which claims that the syncretism in the conceptual domains of Gender, Number and Case is based on extension rather than homonymy, and results in the blending of particular domains (which may be functionally distinct in other cases). This is in accordance with the theoretical claim that fusional morphemes (i.e. morphemes which cover a number of categories) should be analyzed in terms of active zones rather than separate categories. The paper gives an exhaustive overview of the issue, presents a wealth of data, and gives many figures and tables, clearly showing the authors' expertise in the area. Its conclusions and methods may be relevant to linguists with a variety of interests and backgrounds, although these links could have been more explicitly mentioned.

In her paper *The notion of affectedness in expressing interpersonal function* Mirjam Fried deals with what she calls "the dative of empathy" in Czech, using the framework of Construction Grammar (e.g. *No to je **mi** ale náchoda* '**My**, what a coincidence'). Fried argues for a grammatical/pragmatic factor of affectedness, which motivates the extension from the more central dative meanings (e.g. transfer) to the somewhat more peripheral meanings of empathy. In other words, she shows that the "interpersonal" notions present in the dative of empathy require a multi–level view which requires a clear connection of semantic, grammatical and pragmatic factors. Moreover, because of its multidimensionality, the dative of empathy is best dealt with within the Construction Grammar framework. The paper is very clearly written, and offers a nice counterpoint to Divjak's paper, being based on a syntactic analysis – still usage–based but not statistical, and with a more clearly emphasized theoretical framework (of Construction Grammar). It clearly illustrates the functionalist approach of CL offering a network of features as the "formalization" behind the issues discussed.

In their paper on the Russian instrumental (*The Russian instrumental–of–comparison: constructional approach*) Ekatarina Rakhilina and Elena Trib-

ushinina compare the instrumental of comparison (*letela streloj–INS* 'flew like an arrow') with the *kak*–similative construction (*letela kak strela* 'flew like an arrow'). They take a constructional view, and show that the meaning of the instrumental of comparison is not fully predictable from its parts (the noun in the instrumental or the verb requiring the instrumental): the emergent meaning in the instrumental–of–comparison construction includes inherent observability (the construction needs to describe perceptually observable situations), monotonicity (comparison only in terms of shape) and a small cognitive distance between the constituents. This is a "traditional" CL study in the sense that it seeks to develop a semantically–based account on constructional principles within a broadly–set cognitive semantics framework. In this sense it is relevant both in CL and outside it.

Marcin Grygiel's paper, *Constructional realizations of affirmation in Slavic*, gives a detailed account of affirmation, mainly in Serbian. Grygiel shows that affirmation in Slavic may be profitably seen from a de–lexicalization and inheritance point of view, as a family of semantically motivated constructions, the most schematic of which indicate affirmation simply by the lack of negator. His approach is bottom–up, in the sense that the data seems to inevitably lead to the theoretical concepts which have been used, and is therefore a good illustration of the postmodernist tendencies in CL.

The final paper in the first section, *Possessive locative constructions in Macedonian* by Liljana Mitkovska, examines external locative possessive constructions in Macedonian (such as *Toj ja udri* **po rakata** 'He hit her on the arm') and their relation to the more usual dative possessive construction (**Mu** *ja ukrale* **kolata** 'They have stolen his car'). The paper shows that the difference between the two constructions lies in subjectification – the possessor's affectedness is more objective in the locative construction, whereas it is more subjective in the dative construction. Just like Miriam Fried's paper on Czech, it illustrates the importance of affectedness in the grammar of Slavic. Perhaps it would not have come amiss to have made it possible for the two authors to cross–reference their papers, providing greater coherence to the volume at least on the formal level.

The section on cognitive semantics starts with the paper by Mario Brdar and Rita Brdar–Szabó entitled *Not seeing trees for wood: a case study of metonymy–induced polysemy in Germanic and Slavic languages*. In the paper the authors argue for a usage–based account of polysemy network development, which goes from data to theory and back in a cyclic manner, ensuring a natural description based on a widely–set notion of embodiment, extending radially from the body to the immediate physical, social and cultural environment. The paper is data–oriented, and the far–reaching general points are based on a reconstruction of the polysemy network of WOOD and TREE vocabulary in various Germanic and Slavic languages. It is a prime example of a cognitive analysis based on metonymy, offering yet another proof of metonymy as a grammatical phenomenon. It is wide in scope, very readable, and may be of interest to all linguists interested in semantics, regardless of their background.

The semantics section of the book ends with two papers on conceptual metaphor. In her paper entitled *Metaphors and metonymies in Serbian proverbs containing names of animals* Diana Prodanović–Stankić offers an analysis of a corpus of Serbian proverbs which mention animals. The analysis shows that the PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS metaphor is the most frequent, and that it includes a variety of more specific metaphors mapping various animals onto various types of people. Conceptual metonymies on this level were found to be much less frequent. The paper ends with an account of a metaphor recognition and identification task, which showed that participants had trouble identifying metaphorical expressions in proverbs.

The second paper on metaphor is entitled *Emotions as causes of human behavior in Polish and Slovene*. In it Agnieszka Będkowska–Kopczyk offers an analysis of prepositional and case constructions containing emotion nouns in Polish and Slovene. The paper shows that the concept of FORCE is the organizing principle behind emotions seen as causes. FORCE is analyzed as a complex domain, containing mappings related to instruments, various types of external forces and internal forces. Both of these papers illustrate a classical aspect of conceptual metaphor theory in CL: its role in organizing a particular domain, whether defined meta–linguistically or conceptually. In this sense, the two studies are not cutting–edge (because conceptual metaphor studies have now largely moved on to grammatical issues, corpus research, discourse studies, etc.; cf. e.g. Steen 2007; Steen et al. 2010), but do offer insights which might be particularly interesting to Slavic linguists.

The final section deals with cognitive discourse analysis and applied linguistics, and starts with Andrej Kibrik's paper *Cognitive discourse analysis: local discourse structure*. The paper offers an analysis of Russian spoken discourse, and is in fact a (necessarily very condensed) review of issues exhaustively dealt with in a monograph co–edited by the author of the paper. The central claim is that the cognitive approach is a prerequisite for a proper understanding of discourse. The claim is supported by a wealth of data drawn from the monograph, but because of its general nature, the paper is organized in a way that does not problematize the issues involved, but rather illustrates the support for this claim – it is a teaser for the monograph, so to speak. This is by no means a bad thing – the monograph has been published in Russian, and the paper makes the issues referred to much more available to a non–Slavic audience.

As opposed to this, Piotr Twardzisz's paper *Metaphorical expressions in legal language: evidence from Polish* takes a more local view. It deals with conceptual metaphors in Polish legal language, providing a list of metaphors appearing in a corpus of legal Polish that was analyzed. Although the author is widely read on issues related to legal language, the references related to metaphor are limited to Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999), and do not include any recent applied studies (e.g. at least some papers by Lynne Cameron). Moreover, methodological issues related to the procedure of metaphor extraction, which are crucial in an applied linguistics study, are not mentioned. Therefore, this paper would not be a good ambassador of CL in the non–CL world.

141

The final paper entitled *Metaphor validation in polysemous structures: a case of Serbo–Croatian bilingual dictionaries* (by Danko Šipka) suffers from similar shortcomings. It is a case study which aims at testing the theoretical apparatus presented in Steen's (2007) monograph on metaphor, specifically, which of the four models presented in Steen (2007:48–57) is best suited for lexicography. Based on a study of dictionary data, Šipka concludes that the classical Lakoff–and–Johnson two–model approach suffices for lexicographic purposes. As with the previous study, it is difficult to judge a paper which is not based on a more clearly delineated theoretical framework and which fails to mention recent work on conceptual metaphor and lexicography (e.g. Moon 2004, Deignan 2005). Therefore, its possible impact and interest are limited.

As can be seen from this brief presentation, the volume offers a variety of papers dealing with a variety of issues. Most of the papers are well written, and offer considerable insight into the issues they deal with. Moreover, they show what Slavic languages have to offer to CL, and what Slavic CL can offer to linguistics at large. Granted, some of the contributions would have benefited from additional theoretical or methodological input. Perhaps clearer connections between papers would have made it possible to provide a coherent rationale for the volume as a whole. Still – the volume is collection of papers dealing with a range of issues using a range of different methods, and this reflects what cognitive linguistics is – "not a unified theory, but rather a large movement" (p. 9 of the Introduction). In this sense, and precisely because of this, the volume can be of interest to Slavic and non–Slavic scholars, cognitive linguists, and linguists working in other theoretical frameworks.

References

Deignan, Alice. 2005. *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dickey, Stephen M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Divjak, Dagmar, and Agata Kochańska, eds. 2007. *Cognitive paths into the Slavic domain*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Janda, Laura A., and Valery D. Solovyev. 2009. "What constructional profiles reveal about synonymy: A case study of Russian words for SADNESS and HAPPINESS." *Cognitive Linguistics* 20 (2): 367–393.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The middle voice*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1999. Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought. New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2006. Subjectification, grammaticization, and conceptual archetypes. In *Subjectification: various paths to subjectivity*, ed. Angeliki Athanasiadou, Costas Canakis, and Bert Cornillie, 17–40. Cognitive linguistics research 31. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Moon, Rosamund. 2004. "On specifying metaphor: an idea and its implementation." *International Journal of Lexicography* 17 (2): 195–222.

Nesset, Tore, and Laura A. Janda. 2010. "Paradigm structure: Evidence from Russian suffix shift." *Cognitive Linguistics* 21 (4): 699–725.

Steen, Gerard. 2007. *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Steen, Gerard, Lettie Dorst, Berenike Herrmann, Anna A. Kaal, Tina Krenmayr, and Trijntje Pasma. 2010. *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mateusz–Milan Stanojević