

REVIEWS

Karolina Krawczak, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, and Marcin Grygiel (eds.) 2022:
Analogy and Contrast in Language: Perspectives from Cognitive Linguistics.
[Human Cognitive Processing 73]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:
John Benjamins. 442 pp.
ISBN: 9027257450, 9789027257451

Reviewed by: John Newman, University of Alberta, Canada, and Monash University, Australia

Analogy and contrast, along with their near-synonyms sameness and difference, are such fundamental concepts that it is possible to find a relevance for them in a great many endeavours. As an example, Nirenberg and Nirenberg (2021) can be viewed as an extended essay on the role of sameness and difference in a wide range of contemporary and historical ideas and academic disciplines (natural, social, and human sciences, as well as literature). In the words of one reader, cited on the book's dust jacket, the book is "an erudite and insightful exploration of the collision between two distinct ideas: sameness and difference". Much the same could be said of the book under review, *Analogy and Contrast in Language*, the stated purpose of which is to demonstrate that analogy and contrast, understood as cognitive abilities, have an essential role to play in research on language and cognition.

In what follows, I give short but, I hope, helpful summaries of the chapters (apart from the introductory chapter which itself consists mainly of chapter summaries), without making any attempt to explain the theorizing behind each chapter. My approach might strike the reader as overly simplistic and certainly does not do justice to the extent or depth of analysis in each chapter, which is indeed impressive, but it is the most direct way to

give some sense of the scope of the volume, as well as having the virtue of treating all contributors in a fair and comparable way. After the summaries, I will comment on the volume as a whole.

In “What could be more fundamental?”, Ronald Langacker brings an impressive arsenal of cognitive theorizing to bear on the role of analogy and contrast in linguistics. Langacker understands analogy and contrast in the most basic cognitive way as the mind’s registration of sameness (analogy) or difference (contrast), which allows him to develop and illustrate these key concepts in many varied ways. The core of the discussion, however, centres on three main areas: (1) the paradigmatic growth of categories through extension, differentiation, and abstraction; (2) syntagmatic elaboration of units, with emphasis on “layering” as opposed to hierarchical structure; (3) the meanings of modals and negation, understood as departures from a conceptualizer’s baseline model of reality. This chapter is solidly theoretical and is the most wide-ranging in content of all the chapters, with particular importance attaching to Langacker’s more recent ideas of control mode, baseline, and elaboration and a prior acquaintance with these ideas would undoubtedly help a reader work their way through the chapter.

In “Diagrammatic iconicity and rendering time in a narrative text: Analogies and contrasts”, Elżbieta Tabakowska applies the notion of analogy to the analysis of literary texts in a couple of different ways. Analogy is seen as a key feature of the kind of iconicity that can be discerned in the default organization of discourse, whereby the sequence of describing events corresponds to the sequence of actual events. This kind of iconicity can be violated, and Tabakowska takes the reader through a close reading of literary passages highlighting insightfully the roles that present and past tense, perfective and imperfective aspect, deictic adverbs, and pronouns all play in upholding or, more interestingly, violating iconicity in a literary memoir in English that includes a mixture of real and imagined events, alternating between past and present. A second way in which analogy is understood in this chapter is analogy as the relationship between an original literary text and its translation – a number of examples are given of the intricacies of handling tense and aspect in the translation of the original text into Polish.

The analogy of special interest in “Analogy in action: Space-time, perspectival frames, cultural models”, by Adam Głaz, concerns the parallelism that holds between the framing of objects and events in the spatial domain and the linguistic, culturally informed framing of events in discourse. As in the case of Tabakowska’s chapter, the analysis involves a close reading of a text, in this case an English magazine text about immigrants. Głaz teases apart instances of the personal viewpoint on immigrants as expressed by the author of the article and references to the viewpoints of others (with *they*, *people*, etc. as the sources of those viewpoints). This contrast is analysed by

Glaz as analogous to an egocentric vs. allocentric viewpoint relevant to the spatial domain (roughly, the speaker's dynamic and direct experience of a scene vs. a virtual viewer's static experience). Glaz gives more attention than other contributors to elucidating the notion of analogy itself, clarifying the various understandings of analogy that are evident in the literature and reflecting on the structure of analogical argumentation itself, all of which I found extremely useful in coming to terms with the whole volume, not just his own chapter.

In "My enemy's enemy is my friend': Similarities motivated by contrasts in Hungarian sentence structure", Andras Imrényi tackles two overlapping phenomena in Hungarian syntax: (1) the heterogeneity of environments in which an inversion of the usual word/morpheme order takes place, including interrogative clause type, negation, and restrictive adverbs; (2) the heterogeneity of topic-like sentence-initial expressions having to do with space, time, modality, probability, etc. Imrényi adopts a similar strategy in tackling each phenomenon, which is to treat the heterogeneity in each case as a departure from a baseline default, drawing upon Langacker's ideas about baseline and elaboration, referencing also Langacker's chapter. Imrényi's chapter is unusual in the context of the whole volume in the way it very imaginatively relies upon the concept of a shared contrast to a default structure (namely, the same baseline) as the commonality lurking behind the apparent homogeneity of each phenomenon.

In "Contrast and analogy in aspectual distinctions of English and Polish: The case of *think* predicates", Iwona Kokorniak introduces her own model of aspect, which represents a carefully constructed synthesis of different ideas about aspect found in the writings of Comrie, Dahl, Langacker, Talmy, Croft, among others. It is only against this backdrop of a more elaborated model of aspect, Kokorniak argues, that the progressive vs. non-progressive distinction of English can be properly compared with the more schematic, and conceptually more fundamental, perfective vs. imperfective distinction in Polish. She illustrates the value of the model in a contrastive analysis of English *think* and its Polish counterpart *myśleć* (along with their derivative forms and in various construction types) based on close readings of English and Polish sentences drawn from corpora.

Laura Janda's "From nouns to verbs: Analogy across parts of speech" is the first of eight chapters dealing with more quantitative methods. Janda brings together the insights from a research project spanning a number of years to present an updated and more compelling case for the viability of the analogy between nouns and verbs, with the focus on Russian. The argument for the analogy rests on comparisons of three kinds: (1) the count vs. mass noun distinction is compared with the perfective vs. imperfective distinction based on a range of attributes; (2) classifier systems for nouns

in languages such as Yucatec Mayan are compared with the perfectivizing system for Russian verbs, which, it is claimed, constitutes a “temporal classifier” system; (3) the sorting of nouns (based on the relative frequencies of inflected forms in a corpus) by the statistical technique of Correspondence Analysis is compared with the sorting of verbs, also based on the relative frequencies of their inflected forms.

In “Complex prepositions of analogy and contrast in English: A corpus-based analysis”, Anatol Stefanowitsch is concerned not with the linguistic-theoretical understanding of *analogy* and *contrast* as seen in other chapters, but instead turns his attention to constructional properties of four complex preposition types of English closely related to these words: *by/in analogy with/to*; *analogous to/with*, *in/by contrast to/with*, and *contrary to*. Stefanowitsch relies on definitions in online dictionaries and usage as found in the British National Corpus to refine our understanding of these prepositions, providing strong empirical validation of some prior claims, e.g., that the prepositions belong to more intellectualized varieties of English. More importantly, he arrives at many new insights into contrasting behaviours of the four prepositional types. A difference between *by/in analogy with/to* and *analogous to/with*, for example, is claimed that the former states that someone perceives a similarity and uses it in explanations, whereas the latter involves a substantial similarity between entities whether or not it is used in explanations.

In “Emergent categories: Quantifying analogically derived similarity in usage”, Dylan Glynn investigates properties of the word *time* in three large corpora of American English, raising new and interesting issues regarding the quantitative methods employed in Behavioural Profile approaches. Glynn demonstrates the virtue of a quantitative approach in identifying clusters of similar usages of *time*, based on contextual features, without any prior assumptions about sense distinctions, based, say, on dictionary entries. He is able to establish convincing usage clusters based on just semantic features relating to telicity, enumerability, event type, etc. (relying on annotators to assign features), and then extends his analysis to include semantic and formal features simultaneously. Glynn emphasizes (positively) the role of subjective intuition in his analysis and in Behavioural Profile approaches more generally, contra a widespread belief that such approaches work in a purely automated way.

Martin Hilpert and Susanne Flach turn their attention to the alternative ordering of adverb and past participle in passive clauses such as *be widely used* and *be used widely* in their chapter “A case of constructional contamination in English: Modified noun phrases influence adverb placement in the passive”. They argue on the basis of data from the Corpus of Contemporary American English, using multi-factorial regression, that the preference for one of these orders over the other is influenced by usage facts concerning the cor-

responding complex NPs such as *widely used N*, amounting to “constructional contamination”. Higher frequency of an adverb-participle combination in the NP construction leads to greater likelihood of the adverb-initial order in the passive. Their analysis includes more complex measures such as collocational analysis. They find, for example, that the collocation strength between the adverbial and participle within the NP itself is a significant factor leading to higher likelihood of the adverb-initial order in the passive.

In “Analogy and contrast at the morphology-syntax interface: A case study of new Russian [N[N]] compounds,” Svetlana Sokolova examines alternative ways of expressing modification of nouns in Russian, involving foreign elements borrowed from English, focusing mainly on the choice between nominal modification in compounds (*veb-otdel*) and adjectival modification in noun phrases (*vebovyj otdel*) to express ‘web department.’ When the foreign modifier constituent appears as an adjective, we have analogical levelling (to the more usual Russian pattern of modification); when the foreign modifier constituent appears as a nominal we have analogical extension (to a less familiar pattern of Russian). Sokolova relies for her analysis on the Russian National Corpus and the General Internet-Corpus of Russian, as well as her own experimental data, relating preference for modifier type to a surprising number of factors: corpus frequencies (“constructional contamination” enters the picture as in the preceding chapter), genre (nominal modifiers occurs preferentially in formal genres), semantics (nominal modifiers occur most commonly with head nouns relating to “business” words), pragmatics (adjectival modifiers may be used to strengthen a negative evaluation of the phenomenon), and gender of speaker, among others.

In “Modeling constructional variation: A multifactorial account of the contrast in construal between analogical causative constructions in Polish,” Karolina Krawczak investigates the conceptual basis for the choice of a nominal or clausal complement following causal adpositions in Polish such as *ze wzgledu na* ‘because, because of,’ using data from a Polish Blog-Based Corpus. Krawczak relies on a suite of statistical methods, including Correspondence Analysis and mixed effects logistic regression, to arrive at her results. A key finding is that causes expressed nominally (comparable to English *because of*NP) tend to encode given information, whereas causes rendered through clauses (comparable to English *because of*S) are more likely to introduce new information. The author draws attention to the (conceptual and formal) contrast between the nominal and clausal constructions, as well as emphasizing the role of analogy in how speakers categorize new events as one or the other construction.

Tuomas Huumo and Krista Teeri-Niknammoghadam explore the use of Finnish ‘front’/‘back’ constructions to express movement through time and the organization of text in their chapter “Moving reader or moving text?”

Contrasts and analogies between metaphors of time and text organization in Finnish". Just as the passage of time may be conceptualized as Moving Ego (*We are approaching Christmas*) or Moving Time (*Christmas is approaching*), so too the structure of a text may be conceptualized analogically as Moving Reader (*Let's continue forward in the book*) or Moving Story (*From here on the text proceeds normally*). The authors expand on the analogy with variations and subtleties in their comparisons of time and organization of text, e.g., the role of Sequence metaphors to express sequencing in time (*Tuesday follows Monday*) and sequencing in text (*The differences are described later in the book*). The data used for the study comes from a large corpus of online forum discussion.

The final chapter by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Paul A. Wilson, "Contrasts and analogies in cluster categories of emotion concepts in monolingual and cross-linguistic contexts: CONTEMPT", is a multi-methodological investigation into the properties of emotion concepts clustered around the notion of 'contempt' in English and Polish. The authors rely on experimental techniques (a sorting task on emotion words and a task involving the evaluation of emotion words based on 144 emotion features) and corpus-based methods, especially the identification of strong collocates of emotion words in corpora. Given the scope of the investigation (multiple words under investigation, multiple methods and data types, two languages under consideration), the chapter is quite a *tour de force*, and it is not surprising there are a good many results that the authors arrive at. In the monitor corpora they use, for example, there is a strong link between *contempt* and (moral rather than physical) *disgust* in English, whereas in Polish the strongest link is between *pogarda* 'contempt' and *nienawiść* 'hate'. English *contempt* also has a strong legal connection lacking in Polish. The authors claim a key role for analogy in the development of emotion concepts, contra prevailing theories in emotion research in which analogy does not play a significant role.

Reflecting on the volume as a whole, I found the contents to be brimming with imaginative thinking, whether it be in the close reading of texts or in the analysis of the larger amounts of corpus data. While there are similarities between certain chapters (e.g., a focus on identifying the relevant factors favouring one construction over its alternative in the quantitative chapters), the diversity in interpreting and applying the key terms *analogy* and *contrast* left the more lingering impression on this reader. The terms allow for a wide range of applications in different settings, as seen in the chapter summaries above.¹ *Analogy*, in particular, is associated with a range of interpretations, from a meaning like 'sameness' ("analogy is all about discerning degrees of sameness or similarity between different aspects of our experience", in the

¹ The variability in interpretations of *analogy* is evident in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*, where one finds two separate entries for the term (Hogan 2011: 97-99).

words of the editors, p. 2) to more elaborated ideas of analogy as involving equivalences of multiple sub-parts of systems (as in, say, Janda's identification of multiple similarities between noun and verb systems), or the more dynamic influence of one construction over another (as in the idea of constructional contamination in some chapters). The underlying scholarship is exemplary throughout and clearly the volume succeeds in demonstrating the intellectual value that can be derived from thinking in depth about the concepts of analogy and contrast. The flip-side to having such stimulating diversity of contents is that the chapters feel very much like stand-alone contributions. There is very little cross-referencing of other chapters by contributors, though Imrényi draws upon the work of Langacker in a significant way (more a matter of drawing upon Langacker's already published work rather than the specific chapter by Langacker in the volume). This adds to the feeling that the contributors are all going their separate ways, rather than participating in any joint venture. The standard of editing is very high throughout, notwithstanding an unfortunate lapse on p. 343, where a typo in the case of the word *expected* occurs multiple times within the one table.

The editors and individual contributors all appear to agree on the fundamental nature of analogy/similarity and contrast in cognition, as do I. Even so, I had the feeling while reading some chapters, that yet another fundamental dichotomy was playing a role and sometimes the more obvious role, namely the *similarity* vs. *contiguity* contrast. Ziem (2014: 216, fn. 317) offers the opinion: "Although contiguity and similarity are not the only principles that motivate categorization processes ..., they are nonetheless considered to be the two most fundamental and important types of correlation between categories". Superficially at least, similarity and contiguity would appear to be the more relevant principles at work in the discussion of paradigmatic vs. syntagmatic relations in Langacker's chapter and also in the discussion of the complex prepositions and their contexts of usage in the Stefanowitsch chapter, to name a couple of examples. I found myself imagining a volume with the title *Similarity and Contiguity in Language: Perspectives from Cognitive Linguistics*, which might be interestingly paired with the volume under review.

This volume is dedicated to the memory of Iwona Kokorniak.

REFERENCES

- Hogan, Patrick Colm (ed.) 2011: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nirenberg, David and Ricardo L. Nirenberg 2021: *Uncountable: A Philosophical History of Number and Humanity from Antiquity to the Present*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ziem, Alexander 2014: *Frames of Understanding in Text and Discourse: Theoretical Foundations and Descriptive Applications*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.