



Gabrijela Buljan
University of Osijek

Introduction to the Special Issue honoring the memory of Dubravko Kučanda

This collection of papers is a true testament to Dubravko's lasting impact as it features contributions from several authors who participated in the original commemorative issue in 2008, and from a few new contributors. The idea behind this Special Issue was to showcase research that would hark back to Dubravko's love of functional models/frameworks while also symbolizing his nascent interest in what some of the more distinctly Cognitive Linguistic insights could bring to our understanding of the functioning of language. The result is a collection of six papers which all fall under the umbrella of 'functionally oriented linguistics' (Nuyts 2007: 543), but represent sufficiently differentiable research paradigms, traditions, schools of thought within the broad functionalist agenda. It is with due appreciation of the complexity of the Functional Linguistics vs. Cognitive linguistics dynamics (Ruiz de Mendoza & Pérez Hernández 2001; Nuyts 2007, 2008) that I now present the contributions to this issue in what appear to be two sets: on the one hand, papers by Johan van der Auwera, Karolien Janssens/Jan Nuyts and Bernard Comrie, which reflect the kind of functionalism Dubravko diligently pursued most of his career; on the other, contributions by Cristiano Broccias, Branimir Belaj, and Mario Brdar/Rita Brdar-Szabó/Tanja Gradečak, with their more distinctly Cognitive Linguistic flavor.

Quirky negative concord: Croatian, Spanish and French ni's by Johan van der Auwera explores the interaction between connective negation (e.g. 'neither ... nor') and negative concord (NC) in three 'negative concord' languages, viz. Croatian, Spanish, and French. Through felicitous coincidence, the three languages appear to share the same main connective negator *ni*, but they represent different NC systems. This allowed the author to examine the interplay between connective negation and NC in the three systems, though with sights set on formulating plausible generalizations. After briefly presenting the history of the term and interest in negative concord, and noting some points of still active controversy, van der Auwera explains his view of how each exponent of negation contributes to the full expres-

sion of negation, viz. the NC negator (e.g. the Croatian *ne* ‘not’) and the NC item (*ništa* ‘nothing’ in e.g. *ne znam ništa* ‘I don’t know nothing’). Several parameters of variation are then examined. Among them, the position of a single negative indefinite relative to the verb and (non)retention of the NC, which are involved in the non-binary distinction between ‘strict’ NC languages like Croatian and ‘non-strict’ NC languages like Spanish. Fuzzy boundaries are also shown to be due to possible intralanguage variation (different behaviors of different negative indefinites within the same language) or failure of sentence fragments to behave in correlation with the generally strict vs. nonstrict character of a language. Van der Auwera is careful not to overgeneralize the patterns observed to all languages from the same family (e.g. by calling attention to the privative ‘without’ triggering NC in Russian but not Croatian). Finally ‘connective negation’ is introduced by presenting the standard and unconventional phrasal and clausal uses of the English *neither ...nor* construction. From there on, van der Auwera embarks on an in-depth exploration of how connective negation interacts with negative concord in the languages examined. The result is a number of observations about the ‘quirkiness’ (mnemonically marked as Q1, Q2 ... Q11) of the interaction between negative concord and connective negation, like the irrelevance of (in)definiteness for their interaction in Croatian, or the analyzability of Spanish clausal *ni* (*tampoco*) as both an NC negator or an NCI in almost classical non-strict NC, etc. This study showed beyond doubt the special character of NC with connective negation, but ended with six tentative though promising generalizations about the NC/connective negation interplay. The generalizations are once again checked, in a nuanced tabular format, against the situation in Croatian, French, Spanish, and English before the paper closes with pointers to research that has already sprouted from this study or would be a welcome addition to the field.

Karolien Janssens and Jan Nuyts’ *On the origins of the epistemic, evidential, and subjectivity meanings in the mental state predicates: The case of Dutch* is a systematic corpus-based study of the development of speaker-related meanings in five Dutch mental-state predicates. The authors start from the well-known observation that, cross-linguistically, mental-state predicates tend to develop meanings that go beyond objective references to mental states and processes and involve speakers’ subjective evaluations of states of affairs. Their analysis rests on a finely nuanced characterization of the nature of the various ‘speaker-oriented meanings’, and develops into a data-driven discussion of their historical origin and the diachronic relationships between them. The authors give due consideration to how system-internal factors may affect the semantic routes of language change – causing different verbs from the class of mental state predicates to develop different



semantic profiles. Of particular note is the judicious handling of the controversial concept/term ‘subjectivity’. Although it may be understood more broadly as involving ‘speaker-related’ meanings in general, ‘subjectivity’ is here construed as a specific, though least established meaning of mental state predicates. Arguments are presented suggesting that subjectivity is different from the other meaning categories evidenced by mental state predicates, like inferential evidentiality or epistemic modality. While the latter involve various degrees of speaker involvement in qualifying states of affairs, subjectivity as understood here is argued not to be qualificational. The state of affairs is not subject to speaker’s assessment against some background information; subjectivity only involves the marking of whether the speaker’s utterance is her own personal opinion or a view shared with others. Ultimately, given the special positioning of the subjective meaning relative to the other speaker-related meanings in mental state predicates, the authors raise the intriguing question of how well/whether the emergence of subjectivity squares with the understanding of ‘subjectification’ in terms of the hierarchy of qualificational categories. If subjectivity is indeed an instance of subjectification (after all, it is a matter of how the speaker conceives of the world), then the understanding of subjectification in terms of a hierarchy which correlates with degrees of speaker-involvement in qualifying states of affairs may need to be revisited.

Bernard Comrie’s *The afterlife of the antipassive: Alignment shift and transitivity* explores examples from Tsez, Chukchi, and Mayan languages to argue that apparent syntactic anomalies in the expression of transitive clauses can be seen as results of reanalyses of antipassives as/in the direction of ordinary transitive constructions. Comrie mindfully eases the reader into the topic by providing a characterization of the antipassive construction in terms of the set of properties most recently articulated in Janic & Witzlack-Makarevic (2021: 2); viz. the antipassive is an intransitive construction with a verb that can also be found in a transitive construction in the same form and with the same lexical meaning; the A (agent-like core argument) of the transitive construction is encoded as the S (single core argument) of the corresponding antipassive construction; and the P (patient-like core argument) of the transitive construction becomes an oblique or is left unexpressed. Comrie also notes the two main functions of the antipassive, viz. (i) to lower the transitivity of the clause (in the sense of transitivity advocated by Hopper & Thompson 1980) by e.g. omitting the P argument or changing the Aktionsart of the transitive construction towards durativity, habituality etc.; ii) to render accessible to certain syntactic processes the A argument of the transitive construction – which would remain inaccessible to those processes unless turned into the S argument (as in the prohibitive construction in Chukchi discussed in the analysis). This charac-

terization of form and function of the antipassive serves as a platform for examining various examples of departure from the ‘canonical’ expression of antipassive constructions in the three language(s) (groups). Crucial for the argument is the existence of antipassive constructions that, while they still have some of the features of the antipassive (e.g. the durative suffix that effects antipassivization in transitive verbs in Tsez), have changed in the direction of ordinary transitive constructions, typically exhibiting e.g. alignment shift (in the case of Tsez, the ‘resurrection’ of the P with the durative verb form and reverting back to the ergative alignment typical of transitive clauses). Through direct comparison of such antipassives with other coexisting constructions, including the regular antipassive constructions that still exist in the languages in their ‘unadulterated’ form, Comrie was able to argue that an exploration of synchronic constructions that lack the features of typical antipassives need not be thought of as an exercise in the reconstruction, but as a study of the ‘afterlife’ of antipassives that assumes their reanalysis as/in the direction of plain transitive clauses.

The second set of papers opens with Cristiano Broccias’s *A new look at word classes in Cognitive Grammar*. In this study Broccias holds up for scrutiny some of the basic parameters for the conceptual characterization of word classes in Cognitive Grammar (CG). After reminding the reader of the essentials and some recent refinements of the CG-style of word-class definition, Broccias starts building his way toward a proposal for a considerable restructuring of word-class description, while remaining consistent with basic CG assumptions. The author first revisits the debate (Broccias & Hollmann 2007) about the (im)plausibility of the sequential and summary scanning modes as the basis for distinguishing various ‘relation-based’ word classes. Broccias agrees that the two scanning modes have linguistic merit but argues against using them as the sole basis for word class distinction. For instance, he claims that one cannot exclude sequential scanning in principle with some apparent candidates for summary scanning (e.g. event nouns like *collapse*). He also notes that inopportune ‘scanning oscillations’ would need to be assumed in complex VPs like *may have been being followed*, where some components of the composite involve summary, others sequential scanning. The more fundamental question here is what such alternating scanning operations are meant to capture and whether this is even cognitively plausible in view of CG’s usage-based character. Moreover, if, following Langacker’s argument, summary and sequential scanning are not thought of as being mutually exclusive and examples like the complex VP above are accepted as involving sequential scanning because the clause is ‘grounded’, then the very foundation for differentiating between word classes (or different forms of the same word class, like verb forms) in terms of the two scanning types is



weakened because another concept, that of ‘grounding’ (in Broccias’s terms – the semantic function of anchoring), may need to step in. Turning to the idea of ‘relation’, Broccias questions the idea that all verbs, especially all intransitive verbs, profile relationships in the CG sense of the term, e.g. *sleeping* in *Alice is sleeping*. Considering some of the possible defenses for the ‘relationship’ view of examples like *Alice is sleeping* (e.g. Taylor 2002: 215), Broccias argues that the CG idea of relations as profiling interconnections *between entities within a relationship* (reader and book in the activity of reading) is different from the idea of relationships said to exist between an entity and the activity/state itself (i.e. between Alice and the activity of sleeping). Relationality in CG is ultimately not only about conceptual autonomy/dependency (the concept of sleeping depending on the concept of sleeper), but also about interconnections between concepts *within* the relation (in this sense, sleeping is arguably not relational because it is not clear what the other concept within the relationship might be). The paper culminates in a proposal for an appreciable restructuring of the description of word classes in the CG framework. Broccias’s mixed approach involves revising and supplementing the basic cognitive abilities with other criteria (like anchoring) to better capture the essence of word classes. Further, Langacker’s idea of ‘relations’ is dismissed and the burden of differentiating between nouns and non-nominal word classes is laid on the conceptual ability of reification – different from Langacker’s idea of reification as it may not involve summary scanning (a point left for future research). Finally, the idea of temporal scanning as the backbone of non-nominal word classification is reanalyzed as ‘extrinsic’ or ‘intrinsic’, evolving (*redden*) or non-evolving (*red*) categorization sequences.

Branimir Belaj’s *Metonymy and Croatian adverbial clauses* is an exploratory study that appeals primarily to conceptual metonymy and, to a lesser degree conceptual metaphor, image schemata, and Cognitive Grammar, to explain some multifunctionalities/polysemies in the system of Croatian adverbial subordination. Specifically, the author describes the conceptual underpinnings of the multifunctionality of some of the typical connectives introducing subordinate clauses of time, cause, condition, purpose, and concession. The goal is to contribute to the body of cognitive linguistic research into the role of metonymy in grammar, and specifically, its workings at the level of complex sentences; to enrich the description of the semantic aspects of Croatian complex sentences (subordination) and, in the spirit of this issue, to pay homage to Dubravko’s love of syntax and functionalism in all of its guises. The paper starts with a summary of the changing trends in the popularity of metonymy in grammar-oriented cognitive linguistic research. It also pays some credit to earlier research that had explained the multifunctionality of subordinate

connectives by appeal to grammaticalization processes, where metonymy is construed differently, viz. as conversational inferences that develop in unfolding discourse. However, Belaj's intent is to appeal to *conceptual metonymy*, i.e. metonymy as conceived of in Cognitive Linguistics, to explain the conceptual and ultimately possibly also semantic links between e.g. time and cause in connectives like *dok* 'while' or *kad* 'when'; between cause and manner in *kako* 'how', cause and concession in the primarily causative *jer* 'because', and many more. The analysis is presented in several separate sections dedicated each to a specific adverbial meaning and its excursions to neighboring semantic territories, with a clear understanding that the semantic categories are far from discrete. Where necessary, Belaj defends his position against possible alternatives. For instance when, contrary to Heine et al.'s (1991) metaphorical motivation of the time–cause connection, he argues that the connection can only be metonymic, since neither time nor cause are concrete domains, which metaphoric source domains tend/need to be. Of note too is Belaj's attention to how some grammatical features of Croatian subordinate constructions correlate with the finer nuance of semantic interpretation, like the association between two different future tense verb forms with distinct interpretations of real conditionals (the so-called content and real conditionals in the terms of Sweetser (1990)). The paper ends with pointers to further research, since metonymy is hypothesized to most likely also have a hand in other types of subordinate clauses and some types of coordination at complex sentence level.

In the final paper, titled *A note on the career of metaphorical domains: On the role of the XYZ constructions in metaphorical transfer reversal*, Mario Brdar, Rita Brdar-Szabó and Tanja Gradečak explore one particular area of linguistic manifestation of the global COVID-19 crisis, i.e. the semantically and constructionally motivated shifts in the system of conceptual metaphors featuring COVID-19 as one of the two domains of metaphorical construal. It is only natural that the study should first focus on the source domains commonly recruited to help come to grips with this new global threat as the target domain of metaphorical thinking. Here, the authors point to the usual suspects for the metaphorical construal of 'adversarial' concepts like disease, foremost the WAR metaphor, but some others as well. They are careful not to neglect metonymy as yet another conceptual engineer of usage quirks or innovation (e.g. the hardly noticed metonymic uses of the word *coronavirus*, standing for the germ, the disease, and the pandemic), whether it acts solo or in tandem with metaphor, within or across modalities. However, a closer examination of data revealed an interesting trend; viz. COVID-19, the erstwhile target domain, appears to have taken on the function of the source domain for the metaphorical construal of anything perceived as negative or detrimental (e.g. as in *Aids was the*



coronavirus of the time or *Cybercrime is the Coronavirus of the tech world*). The main thrust of the paper is to shed light on this shift by considering two of possibly many precipitating factors. First, the semantic factor that involves matching negative paragons that may be each other's converses (e.g. AIDS and coronavirus, licensing examples like *COVID-19 is the AIDS of this human generation* vs. *AIDS was the Coronavirus of the time*) and allows speakers to tap rich background experience to pass judgement. Second, the specific micro-constructions from the family of XY(Z) constructions as the formal catalyst of this change. As they proceed to develop their argument, the authors make a number of interesting ancillary points of descriptive and theoretical relevance, such as discussing a fuller extent of XYZ constructional variants and the merits of the Unidirectionality Hypothesis, etc. Their exploration of the formal factor starts with a brief recapitulation of the basic anatomy, but also some variability of the XYZ construction, as detailed in some earlier cognitive linguistic studies (e.g. the observation that not every construction that fits the template is indeed figurative, e.g. *Elisabeth II is the Queen of England*). However, the authors also submit some alternative proposals for how the XYZ constructions may have originated, arguing for the idea of *ad hoc* constructions that materialize within the boundaries of ongoing discourse (in line with Brône and Zima 2014). Also, some other constructional variants are then examined previously not discussed in the literature, including the construction deemed pivotal to the domain reversal phenomenon examined in the paper. It is proposed that the biclausal construction (dubbed 'chiastic') like that exemplified in *Lewis is Mercedes and Mercedes is Lewis* (the constructional template A is B and B is A) may be a trigger for the type of domain reversal that we see in the shifting status of COVID-19 from the erstwhile metaphorical target to a new paragon-based source domain.

* * *

On behalf of the Editorial Board, I would like to extend my sincerest thanks to the authors who answered our call and made this Special Issue possible. I have no doubt that our current and future readers will enjoy this very fine collection of papers. For me personally, this issue is more than just a celebration of Dubravko's life and work. The 15th anniversary of his passing coincides with the end of my four-year track as Editor-in-Chief of Jezikoslovlje. In a way, I had planned this issue as a symbolic gesture, a parting gift of sorts dedicated to Dubravko, one of the two pillars of the journal. To the other pillar, my predecessor in the Editorial chair



Mario, I owe my sincerest thanks for entrusting me with leading the journal. I am grateful for the opportunity to experience all the thrills and spills of this responsible duty but also how much hard work and sacrifice goes into making the business run. A special thank you goes out to the journal's Advisory Board for their much needed words of encouragement when I stepped into Mario's shoes. I also thank Goran Tanacković Faletar, Tanja Gradečak and other members of the editorial team for being by my side, above all Višnja Pavičić Takač and Branimir Belaj for their unrelenting support and readiness to pull some of the weight. I am most grateful to Branimir Belaj and Ana Mikić Čolić for agreeing to jointly take the helm and continue maintaining and improving the journal's standing as *Jezikoslovlje's* new Editors-in-Chief. Ana has already done a brilliant job as the journal's secretary, as did her fellow secretaries, Dubravka Vidaković Erdeljić and Sanja Cimer Karaica, and a number of other people who have and will continue to work behind the scenes on smaller, though no less important routine tasks (Bernardica Plaščak, Josipa Selthofer, Vladimir Poličić, Mario Varga, Sean Kušec). Finally, my deepest appreciation goes out to the many reviewers who graciously lent their time and expertise to our journal. Thank you all for recognizing our efforts to secure thoughtful, but best quality feedback to the authors and for finding the time in your busy schedules to support us in what often is very difficult decision-making.

Gabrijela Buljan

References

- Broccias, Cristiano & Hollmann, Willem B. 2007. Do we need summary and sequential scanning in (Cognitive) Grammar? *Cognitive Linguistics* 18. 487–522. <https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2007.026>
- Brône, Geert & Zima, Elisabeth. 2014. Towards a dialogic construction grammar: Ad hoc routines and resonance activation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 25(3). 457–495. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2014-0027>
- Heine, Bernd & Claudi, Ulrike & Hünemeyer, Friederike. 1991. From cognition to grammar – evidence from African languages. In Traugott, Elisabeth Closs; Heine, Bernd (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization 1*, 149–187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56. 251–299.
- Janic, Katarzyna & Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena. 2021. The multifaceted nature of the anti-passive construction. In Janic, Katarzyna & Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena (eds.), *Antipassive: Typology, diachrony, and related constructions*, 1–39. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.130.01jan>



- Nuyts, Jan. 2007. Cognitive linguistics and functional linguistics. In Geeraerts, Dirk & Cuykens, Hubert (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, 543–565. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199738632.013.0020
- Nuyts, Jan. 2008. Pattern versus process concepts of grammar and mind: A cognitive-functional perspective. *Jezikoslovlje* 9(1-2). 87–107.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco. J. & Pérez Hernández, Lorena 2001. Metonymy and the grammar: motivation, constraints, and interaction. *Language and Communication* 21. 321–357.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, John R. 2002. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.