

INSTEAD OF AN INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the first issue of the cognitive linguistic journal *Language, Mind, Culture and Society (LaMiCuS)*. The journal's title reflects two key features of cognitive linguistics: an assumption that language is not autonomous, but is instead integrated with broader abilities organizing human cognition, such as categorization, conceptualization, and information processing — and the one that language is intertwined with culture and society. In this way, the title presupposes a broad area of linguistic research informed by multiple approaches that need not be fully compatible with one another, even though they are founded on a number of shared assumptions. As described by Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens,

Cognitive Linguistics is a flexible framework rather than a single theory of language. In terms of category structure (one of the standard topics for analysis in Cognitive Linguistics), we might say that Cognitive Linguistics itself, when viewed as a category, has a family resemblance structure [...]: it constitutes a cluster of many partially overlapping approaches rather than a single well defined theory (2007: 4).

LaMiCuS is the official journal of the Polish Cognitive Linguistics Association (PCLA). It aims at presenting the achievements of Polish cognitive linguists, along with latest trends in international cognitive linguistics. Research on meaning and the relations between language and culture had been conducted in Poland for several decades before it moved, at first unintentionally, toward the spirit of the cognitive linguistic model formulated in America by, among others, George Lakoff and Charles Fillmore. Shortly thereafter, Polish linguists started to make use of the instruments developed by American cognitive linguists on a regular basis. From this connection emerged highly original conceptions. Inspired by cognitive linguistics, Russian semantics, and structuralism, the research conducted by the Warsaw school of semantics turned out to be particularly seminal. In Lublin, the research on folklore informed by Humboldt's philosophy of language, Sapir and Whorf's linguistic

relativity, and by the findings of Russian linguists concerning the relations between language and culture tied in with cognitive linguistics, which gave rise to cognitive ethnolinguistics. It is a major goal of *LaMiCuS* to popularize this kind of research — research accomplished by Polish linguists which stems from a range of inspirations, including, but not limited to, cognitive linguistics.

The inaugural issue comprises articles illustrating several important tendencies in the latest research situated in the broad area of cognitive linguistics. The issue opens with a contribution from Zoltán Kövecses titled “Conceptual metaphor theory: Some new proposals.” This article demonstrates that the study of metaphor, which spurred a rapid development of cognitive linguistics nearly four decades ago, continues to prompt research problems and provoke questions that are both current and weighty. More specifically, Kövecses argues that research into metaphor should place greater emphasis on the pivotal role of context in the creation and use of metaphors in discourse and relate the methodology of studying metaphor to a multi-level conceptual hierarchy of experience. In conclusion, Kövecses emphasizes that the study of metaphors needs to be extended beyond cases involving correlations between sensorimotor experience and abstract ideas and take into account four kinds of experience: situational, discursive, conceptual-cognitive, and bodily.

The contribution by Adam Gład, titled “Worldview as cultural cognition,” is an example of how a combination of multiple strands of reflection on language may provide insight into the world, human knowledge, and cognitive processing. Drawing inspiration from Bartmiński, Underhill, Wierzbicka, and Sharifian, Gład uncovers what their work has in common: an idea of cultural cognition and its reflection in language. Then through an analysis of two texts describing the same event — the 2016 terrorist attack in Nice — Gład describes divergent viewpoints, attention foci, and degrees of specificity, thereby revealing differences pertaining to cultural content.

In his article “Translating minds: Cognitivism and translation,” Krzysztof Hejwowski characterizes a translator’s effort as a process which on the one hand involves reconstructing the world in the source text with reference to scenes, thematic networks, scripts, and viewpoints and, on the other hand, results in producing a new text that will presumably activate similar mental structures in target-language readers. Additionally, Hejwowski points to pre-cognitivist ideas in Polish translational research of the 1950s, which yet again corroborates the generalization formulated a few years ago by Elżbieta Tabakowska: “The history of both older and more recent Polish linguistics interweaves many threads indicating an intuitively cognitive approach to language” (2004: 5).

In an article “Onstage or off, or somewhere in between? Intersubjectivity markers in Dawkins and Lennox’s debate ‘Has science buried God?’” Shala Barczewska sheds light on the problem of linguistic expression of (inter)subjectivity

through both qualitative and quantitative analysis of the ways in which the pronoun *you* and its derivatives were used in the 2008 debate “Has science buried God?” held between zoologist Richard Dawkins and mathematician and philosopher of science John Lennox at the Oxford University Museum of Natural History. In an in-depth analysis carried out with the use of the theoretical-descriptive apparatus of Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar, Barczewska demonstrates that the participants of the 2008 debate use second person pronouns (*you, yours, yourself*) for different purposes. While Dawkins uses the pronouns primarily with reference to an impersonal, hypothetical ‘other,’ and his overall strategy consists in placing his own perspective on the complexity of life onstage, in defending it, and then leaving it to the listener to accept or reject his construal, Lennox utilizes them with a view to engaging his interlocutor more directly and bringing him over to share Lennox’s vantage point for viewing life’s complexity.

In her article “Corpus-based methods in cognitive semantics: The case of English clausal complementation,” Agnieszka Kaleta discusses two statistical methods for analyzing corpus data: behavioral profiles and colostruational analysis. In the empirical part, she applies colostruational analysis, or rather its sub-type: distinctive collexeme analysis, to the study of sentence semantics of constructions with aspectual verbs (e.g. *start*) and with emotion verbs (e.g. *love*) in English. Both these verb types may take a complement expressed by the *to*-infinitive or gerund. This makes them perfect material for the distinctive collexeme analysis, which has been developed for the comparison of the distribution of quasi synonymous forms and functions. Kaleta proposes that the differences in the usage of these two types of clausal complementation are motivated by different image schemata. The *to*-infinitive complements express the image schema of a PATH, while the gerundival complements represent reified processes. Additionally, in the constructions with the verbs of emotions the *to*-infinitive expresses the volitional character of the whole construction, while the gerundival complement expresses the positive or negative attitude to a given action or process. Kaleta also analyses two pairs of constructions with performatives: *promise -ing/that* and *admit -ing/that* with the use of behavioral profiles, which allow her to identify subtle differences in their meanings. These case studies lead Kaleta to a general observation about the applicability of corpus studies in the semantic analysis of sentence constructions. The main advantage they offer is the possibility to gauge the frequency of occurrence of various constructions and their contexts of use. This in turn allows the researcher to identify the prototypical and the peripheral forms. The fact that the schematic sentence constructions that have a high degree of abstraction are not directly reflected in the corpus Kaleta sees as a downside of corpus methods. Yet, one may argue as well that the fault resides not in the corpus methods, but in the weakness of the theoretical constructs, which do not lend themselves to appropriate operationalizations.

The last two contributions to the inaugural issue of *LaMiCuS* relate to the idea of conceptual integration, put forward by Fauconnier and Turner. One is predominantly polemical, while the other highlights the advantages of the analytical framework of conceptual integration as an instrument for the description of occasionalisms functioning in a multimodal context. In an article titled “Intensification and metonymy in some XYZ constructions: From *the Bible* to *Einstein*,” Mario Brdar analyses figurative uses of what is called the XYZ construction, in which Y is realized as *Bible*, *oasis*, *flagship*, or *minefield*. The author claims that despite their superficial similarity to metaphors, these expressions are different in that they do not involve the degree of polysemy that normally characterizes metaphorical vehicles. Therefore, they are figurative uses with an intensifying function, resulting from metonymic shifts. They are also related to another subtype of the same XYZ construction, where Y is a proper name and the whole construction is based on metonymic paragon models. As a result, both subtypes of the construction are complex intensifiers that compress the intensification process and the property being intensified into a single lexeme.

In her article “Context-dependent derivational innovations found in online journalistic texts and their comments,” Krystyna Waszakowa concentrates on effective decoding of nonce words used in a context-determined speaker-hearer interaction. Analysing *kamerundyner*, a derivational innovation that occurred in a meme commenting on the behaviour of Ryszard Petru, leader of the Nowoczesna (‘Modern’) party, Waszakowa refers to structural linguistics when discussing its form and employs approaches developed within cognitive linguistics to account for the way this novel expression is conceptualized by both the speaker and the hearer. The analysis is based on a four-space conceptual integration network model as proposed by Fauconnier and Turner. In addition, Waszakowa invokes two important notions that contribute to an in-depth interpretation of *kamerundyner*, i.e. Langacker’s notion of *usage event* and Kubriakova’s concept of *analogy*. Waszakowa’s contribution invokes the spirit of the Warsaw school of semantics in that it is a model example of how to complement a structuralist description with a cognitivist analysis, but also of how to combine Western and Eastern traditions of linguistic thought.

LaMiCuS will also feature reviews of books written by Polish and foreign authors on the complex relations between language, culture, and cognition. The reviews will hopefully deepen the understanding of these relations, but they are also intended to aid our readers in following publications on this area. The first issue contains three reviews. In the first one, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk looks at a book comprising a series of lectures by one of the founding fathers of cognitive linguistics, Ronald Langacker. In the second review, Krzysztof Kosecki discusses a collection of articles on embodiment edited by Marek Kuźniak, Bożena Rozwadowska, and Michał Szawerna. In

the last one, Marek Kuźniak, co-editor of the volume on embodiment, reviews a cognitively flavored book on translation authored by Piotr Blumczyński.

We wish to invite readers and contributors alike to direct our attention to books which they think merit a discussion in review articles, in the hope that through their publication *LaMiCuS* will become a better vehicle for exchanging scholarly reflection on language, but also, and no less importantly, for popularizing the cognitive view of language with Polish linguists.

Most of the research problems tackled in the inaugural issue of *LaMiCuS* were discussed at the annual PCLA conferences, which, for a number of years, have facilitated the circulation of ideas within the communities of cognitive linguists in Poland and abroad. At this juncture, it is important to note that this would not be possible had it not been for the efforts of Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, a founder of PCLA and its first president, and her colleagues from the University of Łódź, who jointly conceived of PCLA as a forum for exchanging cognitivist reflections on language. It was in the final years of the previous century in Łódź, that a favorable intellectual climate was created which provided a ground not only for a creative reception of cognitive theories of language, especially the ones propounded in America, but also for their original development. At that time, most prominent Polish cognitivists were associated with the Łódź circle. Notable examples include Tomasz P. Krzeszowski, an important precursor of cognitive linguistics in Poland and the translator of Lakoff and Johnson's seminal book *Metaphors We Live By*; Aleksander Szwedek, the founder of the Department of Cognitive Linguistics at the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań; Joanna Ślósarska, a literary critic and art theorist who promoted application of cognitive linguistic methodology to the analysis of works of art; and the second PCLA president, Alina Kwiatkowska, who continued Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk's efforts to promote cognitive linguistics in Poland and integrate the Polish community of cognitive linguists.

Cognitive linguists making up the Łódź circle worked in tandem with cognitively minded researchers from the University of Gdańsk, Jagiellonian University, the University of Warsaw, the University of Silesia in Katowice, and Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin. In 1979, Tomasz P. Krzeszowski moved from Łódź to Gdańsk, where he supervised doctoral dissertations by many up-and-coming linguists, most notably Bogusław Bierwiaczonek, Wojciech Kubiński, and Kamila Turewicz, who subsequently contributed to the popularization and development of the cognitive approach to language. In Gdańsk, Krzeszowski's collaboration with Roman Kalisz resulted in the creation of a thriving center for research in cognitive linguistics. Subsequently, other Polish centers for cognitive linguistics emerged, due to the efforts of Elżbieta Tabakowska in Cracow, Elżbieta Górská in Warsaw, Iwona Nowakowska-Kempna in Katowice, and Henryk Kardela in Lublin.

The Polish community of cognitive linguists owes the tradition of holding annual meetings during conferences titled “Cognitive Linguistics in the Year...” to Bogusław Bierwiaczonek, who took up presidency of PCLA with great enthusiasm in 2011. Since then, each successive PCLA conference has attracted multiple guests from abroad. Past plenary speakers have included such prominent representatives of international cognitive linguistics as Dirk Geeraerts, Christopher Hart, Martin Hilpert, Laura Janda, Suzanne Kemmer, Leonard Talmy, and Jordan Zlatev. Still, PCLA’s annual conferences have also shown that the development of cognitive linguistics in Poland is sometimes hindered by such barriers as the lack of standardized Polish terminology and insufficient cross-fertilization of ideas among researchers from different university faculties and departments. We hope that *LaMiCuS* will help remove these barriers by featuring research articles in English and Polish and by supplementing each research article published in English with a sizable abridgement in Polish and vice versa. Last but not least, we hope that our journal will continue the best traditions of cognitive linguistics in Poland.

Editorial Board

REFERENCES:

- Geeraerts, Dirk, Hubert Cuyckens 2007: *Introducing Cognitive Linguistics*. In: Dirk Geeraerts, Hubert Cuyckens (eds.) 2007: *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 3–21.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta 2004: *Kognitywizm po polsku — wczoraj i dziś*. Kraków: Universitas.