Volume 3 of LaMiCuS continues the research line outlined in the previous two volumes. It contains articles that follow the cognitive linguistic tradition as originally developed in the United States, as well as those that rely on the Lublin School of Ethnolinguistics. Two contributions offer a cognitive approach to multimodality, one draws on psycholinguistic approach to communicating and understanding emotions.

Hubert Kowalewski analyses the premises and practice of Langacker’s (1987, 2008, 2016, 2017) cognitive grammar, which he approaches from the perspective of the philosophy of science, in particular, structural empiricism (Van Fraassen 1980, 2002, 2008). Kowalewski shows that, within this perspective, theoretical concepts should be empirically adequate, but do not need to be directly observable in empirical data. Graphic representations enjoy a similar status, as they constitute mathematically formalized theoretical claims. The use of invented examples in theory modelling is justified as empirical testing is the next step of theory development.

The article by Małgorzata Misiak follows the Lublin School of Ethnolinguistics (cf. Bartmiński 2012, Niewiara 2009, Tambor 2008) and focuses in Lemko identity. The study is based on an analysis of ethnographic interviews, which shows that Lemko self-image can be described in terms of four main profiles: Lemko – a victim of history, Lemko – an exile, an ethnic and cultural Lemko, and Lemko – a peasant. These profiles emerge in the context of the multidimensional opposition SELF – OTHER – ALIEN and the binary opposition US – THEM.

Weronika Drosdowska and Agnieszka Mierzwińska-Hajnos continue the focus on multimodality, the key theme of LaMiCuS, volume 2. Drosdowska’s study combines the theory of metaphor and metonymy originating with Lakoff and Johnson (2003) with social semiotics as proposed by Kress (2010) to analyze the still under-investigated genre of TV series. The starting point of her project is the list of metaphors and metonymies of fear as proposed
by Kövecses (1990, 2004, 2008). Drosdowska shows that there are some differences in how these metaphors are realized in the verbal and visual mode. For example, verbal metaphors allow for a more abstract understanding of fear (FEAR IS CURRENCY), while in the visual mode they seem more concrete (FEAR IS A TRAP). This does not mean, however, that the filmic mode does not allow for the construction of the sense of uncertainty, which illustrates diffused, unidentified sources of fear (e.g. filming an escape with a hand held camera as a realization of FEAR IS A TORMENTOR metaphor).

In her article, Agnieszka Mierzwińska-Hajnos approaches a challenging task of analyzing selected modalities (verbal and musical) of an operatic piece (cf. Kühl 2007), within the framework of conceptual integration theory as proposed by Brand and Brand (2005). She focuses on the textual and musical layer of the aria Vissi d’Artez from Puccini’s Tosca. Her study serves as an example of how conceptual integration theory allows researchers to analyze each mode separately to finally combine them in the blend.

The study by Francesca Carbone has been conducted within the experimental psycholinguistics paradigm and, similarly Drosdowska’s contribution, concerns emotions. It does not, however, explore the image of a particular emotion in a work of fiction, but rather the perception and recognition of emotions in spontaneous speech in experimental conditions. The stimulus came from emotionally loaded TV interviews from the French EmoTV corpus. The results show that emotions are recognized more accurately and faster in the case of congruent multimodal stimuli (cf. Collignon et al. 2008; Pell 2005; De Gelder & Vroomen 2000; Massaro & Egan 1996), i.e., when the listeners have access to both semantic and prosodic information.

In this 3rd volume of LaMiCuS we propose a new form of scholarly exchange: the Debate. This section of our journal will give floor to discussants at PCLA conferences, where a discussion panel on specific themes will from now on be, hopefully, regular practice. Our first debaters are Barbara Danycgier, Johanna Kißler, and Dylan Glynn: they discuss the nature of multimodal communication and approaches to analyzing it. We hope that this section, in a lighter form, will enhance the impact of cognitive linguistics on students and young researchers, who can then pursue specific issues in full-fledged academic discourse.

The Reviews section contains one review in Polish and three in English. First, Renata Przybylska discusses Krystyna Waszakowa’s monograph Kognitywno-komunikacyjne aspekty słowotwórstwa, whose author approaches Polish word-formation from the perspective of Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar (and, to an extent, Fauconnier and Turner’s Mental Spaces Theory), capitalizing at the same time on the findings of structural linguistics. Then Andreas Baumann reviews William Edmondson’s proposal in the latter’s The Sequential Imperative, in which Edmondson seeks correlations between grammar,
linguistic aspects of cognition, and the functional specialization of the brain – and all in the context of evolution. Next, Martin Hilpert offers his assessment of Adele Goldberg’s intriguing *Explain Me This*, a monograph devoted to construction grammar approach to grammaticality judgments. Finally, Adam Głaz looks at a publication with a significant cultural component and couched within Anna Wierzbicka’s NSM framework: a concise volume edited by Bert Peeters, titled *Heart- and Soul-Like Constructs across Languages, Cultures, and Epochs*. We hope that the reviews will throw useful light on the content and level of the broad range of publications being discussed.
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