РАЗУМНОЕ ПОВЕДЕНИЕ И ЯЗЫК

LANGUAGE AND REASONING

INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

CENTER FOR COGNITIVE STUDIES,
PHILOLOGICAL FACULTY,
LOMONOSOV MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY

LANGUAGE AND THOUGHT:

CONTEMPORARY
COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

ЯЗЫК И МЫСЛЬ:

СОВРЕМЕННАЯ КОГНИТИВНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА

УДК 80/81
ББК 81
   Я 41

Р е ц е н з е н т ы :
член-корр. РАН, д-р психол. н. Б. М. Величковский
член-корр. РАН, д-р филол. н. В. А. Виноградов

Я 41

Я

Международный коллектив авторов сборника, впервые собравшийся в таком составе, представляет панораму современной когнитивной лингвистики. Когнитивная лингвистика понимается максимально широко — как исследование любого аспекта языка в связи с познавательными процессами человека. Сборник состоит из трех разделов. В статьях первого раздела обсуждается общая архитектура языка в когнитивной перспективе. Два последующих раздела посвящены двум основным режимам существования языка — язык как хранилище и язык как коммуникативный процесс. Книга будет полезна не только специалистам — лингвистам, психологам, исследователям в области искусственного интеллекта, — но и широкому кругу читателей, интересующихся строением языка, его эволюцией, процессами познания, мышления и речевой коммуникации.

УДК 80/81
ББК 81

ISBN 978-5-9906039-9-8

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

III. ЯЗЫК КАК ПРОЦЕСС. КОММУНИКАЦИЯ. ON-LINE

LANGUAGE AND THOUGHT: CONTEMPORARY COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

The international team of authors, brought together here for the first time, offers a panoramic view of contemporary cognitive linguistics. Cognitive linguistics is understood as broadly as possible, as the study of any aspect of language in connection with human cognitive processes. The book consists of three sections. The chapters in the first section discuss the general architecture of language from a cognitive point of view. The following two sections are devoted to two perspectives on language: language as storage of knowledge and language as a communicative process. The volume is expected to be useful not only to specialists in linguistics, psychology, and artificial intelligence, but also to a wide range of readers interested in the structure of language, its evolution, and processes of cognition, thought, and speech communication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (WITH CHAPTER ABSTRACTS)

I. GENERAL. EVOLUTION. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Aleksandr E. Kibrik, 1939—2012
(Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia)

The author offers his understanding of language exploration from a cognitive point of view. The main question concerns the possibility of linguistically reconstructing a cognitive structure, relying on the principle of cognitive motivation behind linguistic form. A technique for such reconstruction is proposed and applied to specific linguistic examples from structurally diverse languages, including Russian, Tsakhur, Dargwa, Bagwalal, Bengali, Alutor, etc., all illustrating the phenomenon of markedness, correlated with the cognitive operator norm vs. deviation from norm. Special attention is given

to the phenomenon of inversible markedness, especially in the
situation of "anomalous" form-meaning correspondences. The
scope of inversible markedness includes systemic correlations
between the values of various parameters from the point of
view of the operator of cognitive norm. Some of the value
combinations correspond to the cognitive norm while others
diverge from it.

Language accomplishes its major function by associating
thoughts with sounds, and at the same time by organizing
thoughts in ways that make this association possible. We thus
need above all to develop a fuller understanding of thoughts.
Although we spend our lives thinking, just what we are doing
is far from clear, nor is the relation of thinking to language,
which plays a crucial role in thinking but is far from the whole
story. Various disciplines have an interest in these questions
and can contribute in various ways to answering them. The
paper moves from linguistics to psychology, showing how
they can combine to provide a fuller understanding of thoughts
and language.

In this paper I cite data from the genesis of syntactic
complexity in order to discuss the fundamental unity of the
three developmental trends found in language: diachrony,
ontogeny (acquisition) and phylogeny (evolution). I note
the strong parallels between those three processes and
suggest that they involve not only mere analogy but actual
shared mechanisms. To support this heretic idea, I cite well
known facts from biological evolution that link the actual
developmental mechanisms of phylogeny to ontogeny, on the
one hand, and to everyday adaptive behavior/learning, on the
other. Lastly, I suggest that language diachrony can be viewed
as everyday adaptive behavioral innovation, provided one does
not view diachrony as just the end product of long-gapped
historical changes, but rather as the concatenation of multiple
instances of adaptive individual behaviors that take place on-
line during everyday communication. The latter perspective
is easier to adopt when one studies synchronic variation,
grammaticalization and internal reconstruction.

The first section of this paper deals with the crisis of contemporary theoretical linguistics, illustrating the coexistence and independent development of a number of mutually exclusive language theories such as those of Noam Chomsky, Ray Jackendoff, Igor Mel'čuk, George Lakoff, etc. The second section demonstrates that, apparently, neither scientific disputes, the interdisciplinary approach nor experimental data reconcile the varying schools of linguistic thought. In the conclusion, it is postulated that the only possible way out of this theoretical dead end is the development of a unified concept, an evolutionary synthetic theory of language. The article contains a brief outline of the theory in question.

The article addresses the issue of the lasting methodological crisis in linguistics which, as a science, lacks a clearly formulated research project. Absence of a unified methodology accounts for the fuzziness of the subject matter of linguistics and prevents any pointed discussion of the function of language as a kind of species-specific, biologically grounded, socially informed interactional activity. A way out of the methodological dead end that would allow linguists to develop a synthetic theory is seen in viewing individual human organisms and human society as living systems whose organization is based in embodied orientational interactions — that is, natural language.

This paper offers an analysis of technical terms widely used in present-day cognitive linguistics and other cognitive disciplines, viz.: *znanie* 'knowledge', *znak* 'sign', *informacija* 'information', *kognicija* 'cognition', etc. Special attention is paid to the term *information* as it is used in the humanities. It is suggested to take this notion as a semantic primitive not reducible to a structure of simpler constituents. One more point to be emphasized is the role of ordinary language in the processes of coining new technical terms.

> Usually it is considered that cognitive linguistics started being created in the 1950s — 1960s. However some ideas anticipating this paradigm were expressed much earlier, by W. von Humboldt. One can also note such scholars as K. Vossler, V. Voloshinov, A. Sechehaye, A. Gardiner, K. Bühler, V. Abaev. They did not limit themselves to the analysis of linguistic structure, but tried to study the functioning of language, to connect language with the speaker.

II. LANGUAGE AS STORAGE KNOWLEDGE. SEMANTICS. OFF-LINE

> How do people construct their mental representations of time? I focus on work examining the role that spatial metaphors and basic spatial representations play in constructing representations of time across languages. The results reveal that the metaphors we use to talk about time have both immediate and long-term consequences for how we conceptualize and reason about this fundamental domain of experience. How people conceptualize time appears to depend on how the languages they speak tend to talk about time, the current linguistic context (what language is being spoken), and also on the particular metaphors being used to talk about time in the moment. Further, people who conceptualize space differently also conceptualize time differently suggesting that people co-opt representations of the physical world (e. g., space) in order to mentally represent more abstract or intangible entities (e. g., time). Taken all together these findings show that conceptions of even such fundamental domains as time differ dramatically across cultures and groups. The results reveal some of the mechanisms through which languages and cultures help construct our basic notions of time.

> Croft in his *Verbs. Aspect and causal structure* proposes a typology for aspect and a means of diagramming aspectual