

A DAY, and LIFE IS A FLUID. Finally, the presentation discusses how Marvell imaginatively organizes what otherwise would be considered mere stock metaphors into an intricate logical network specifically tailored to sustain an argumentative line where love and passion become central components of an altogether different universe where objective time is no longer a threat, so much so that both lovers, if they will yield to passion, will not not even mind accelerating their own deaths.

Berberovic, Sanja & Delibegovic Dzanic, Nihada

University of Tuzla, Bosnia-Erzegovina

Is a picture really worth a thousand political words: Political Internet memes and conceptual blending

The essence of democracy lies in the possibility to express different views freely, challenge widely held beliefs publicly and criticize those in power. In highly developed democracies, the criticism of democratic processes through humor in public discourse, ranging from jokes and political cartoons to late-night comedy shows, has proven to be very powerful. Such power lies in engaging an apathetic public in democratic processes, as well as revealing hidden ideologies. Recently, new forms of criticism have been gradually emerging on social media and the Internet as forms of the grassroots political activism in the form of Internet memes. The aim of the paper is to uncover the extent to which political memes as forms of grassroots political activism can criticize the current political affairs and the state of the society in general and thus discern the political rhetorical and ideological goals. Specifically, applying conceptual integration theory, the paper analyzes the construction of meaning of humorous political memes as innovative ways of providing political commentaries on current political affairs. The meaning of political memes is constructed in conceptual blending as a basic cognitive mechanism. As it is claimed (Coulson and Pascual 2006, Coulson and Oakley 2006, Coulson 2006, Oakley and Coulson 2008) that blending can be used as a rhetorical tool influencing the audience to change the reality and even act upon it, the analysis of the construction of meaning of political memes as products of conceptual integration can reveal hidden ideologies in political discourse.

References

- Coulson, Seana. 2006. "Conceptual blending in thought, rhetoric, and ideology." In *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*, eds. Gitte Kristiansen, Michel Achard, René Dirven and Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, 187-210. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Coulson, Seana and Esther Pascual. 2006. "For the sake of argument: Mourning the unborn and reviving the dead through conceptual blending." *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 4: 153-181.
- Coulson, Seana and Todd Oakley. 2006. "Purple persuasion: Conceptual blending and deliberative rhetoric." In *Cognitive Linguistics Investigations: Across languages, fields and philosophical boundaries*, ed. June Luchenbroers, 47-65. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fauconnier, Gilles and Mark Turner. 2002. *The Way We Think*. New York: Basic Books
- Oakley, Todd and Seana Coulson. 2008. "Connecting the dots: Mental spaces and metaphoric language in discourse." In *Mental Spaces in Discourse and Interaction*, eds. Todd Oakley and Andres Hougaard, 27-50. Amsterdam : John Benjamins.

Besedina, Natalia & Shemaeva, Elena

Belgorod State University, Belgorod, Russia

Conceptual metonymy in lexicalization

Recent research on metonymy in a cognitive linguistics frame has emphasized the modeling function of conceptual metonymy. This paper gives an insight into the way metonymy models lexicalized plurals in English. We examine cases when plural nouns no longer refer to a simple multitude of similar objects, that is, they denote another class of objects (e.g., *wheels* - "a car", *drops* - "liquid medicine", *beads* - "a piece of jewellery"). In theoretical terms, the proposed analysis uses the analytical tools of conceptual metonymy and cognitive semantics which can adequately explain and provide a new interpretation of lexicalized plurals (Lakoff, Johnson 2003; Evans, Green 2006; Boldyrev 2014). Adopting a fresh perspective we use conceptual analysis and cognitive modeling as commonly used methods of cognitive researches in linguistics, combining them with corpus-based methods (a dataset is pulled from BNC), this paper hopes to model the semantics of lexicalized plurals and analyze mechanisms underlying the lexicalization process. As it is widely assumed in cognitive linguistics, conceptual metonymy involves substitution of one element of a conceptual structure by another (Lakoff 1987). In the broad sense, it is the model of conceptualization of the world and representation of knowledge about the world in human mind. Another observation which seems to be relevant in this respect is the interpretive character of this model. Within the framework of our approach conceptual

metonymy is argued to be treated as a cognitive mechanism of lexicalization of plural nouns which is carried out according to different models. In English possible models are: **part – whole** (*wave / waves* - “the sea”), **attribute of action – action** (*card / cards* - “a game”), **contents – container** (*trunk / trunks* - “men’s shorts”), **quality – object** (*green / greens* - “green vegetables”), **material – product made from this material** (*tweed / tweeds* - “clothes made of tweed”), **quality – person** (*authority / authorities* - “a person or group having power), **action – event** (*talk / talks* - “formal discussions or negotiations”), **action – result** (*manufacture / manufactures* - “manufactured goods”), **effect – cause** (*woe / woes* - “things that cause sorrow or distress”), **weather phenomenon – period of time** (*rain / rains* - “the season of heavy continuous rain”), **substance – space** (*sand / sands* - “space covered with sand”), **feeling – mode of expression of feeling** (*honour / honours* - “an official award for achievement”). This research allows us to reveal and describe metonymical models that determine formation of senses expressed by lexicalized plural nouns in the discourse. In our approach we lay special emphasis on the fact that the possibility for plural nouns to express a wide range of new senses is provided by the interpretive character of conceptual metonymy.

References

- Boldyrev, N. (2014). *Cognitive Semantics*. Tambov: Publishing House of Tambov State University.
 Evans, V., Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
 Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: Chicago UP.
 Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: Chicago UP.

Bierwiazonek, Boguslaw
 University of Czestochowa, Poland
Toward a typology of constructions

The presentation is an attempt to examine critically the approaches to constructions represented by Taylor (2002), Goldberg (2006) and Hilpert (2014) and propose a tentative typology of constructions based on Langacker’s basic insight that language is a inventory of symbolic units, i.e. conventional pairings of linguistic forms and meanings. Without denying that in fact constructions form a continuum, the typology divides all constructions into lexical, syntactic and asyntactic ones, which form a taxonomy with varying degrees of specificity. The category of a-syntactic constructions corresponds to “irregular sentences” (although some of the a-syntactic constructions are phrasal) in Quirk et al. (1985:11.38) and “nonsentential utterance types” discussed by Culicover and Jackendoff (2005, Ch.7). I suggest that a number of these constructions can be accounted for in terms constructional metonymy as Parts of larger constructions. Talking about the taxonomy of constructions differing in the degree of their generality and specificity, I argue against one of the dogmas of Goldberg’s version of construction grammar, which says that all syntactic forms can and should be characterized semantically, by showing that if the network model of grammar is to be retained, we must allow also for construction schemas, i.e. formal constructs devoid of semantic content. I discuss such schemas in English morphology and syntax. Another category of constructions that need to be distinguished are Information Packaging Constructions. A unique property of these constructions is that they all have more or less syntactically regular semantic equivalents and what distinguishes them from those regular constructions is that they are licensed by different construals of the same propositional contents in terms old/familiar and new/unfamiliar information and the related notions of Topic and Comment on one hand and Focus and Presupposition on the other. I discuss two different sets of such constructions as proposed by Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Hilpert (2014) and try to show that neither set is satisfactory and complete. Furthermore, a category of Illocutionary Constructions is distinguished, which cuts across the lexical – syntactic – asyntactic boundaries, i.e. there are Illocutionary Constructions consisting of single words, phrases, perfectly regular syntactic structures as well considerably idiosyncratic syntactic structures. It is also speculated that we should extend the notion of construction to conventional discourse units, which could be called “discourse constructions”. The talk ends with a few cross-linguistic observations showing how different languages go about expressing the same semantic structures by different kinds of constructions belonging to different categories of constructions.

References

- Culicover, P. and Jackendoff, R. (2005) *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Goldberg, A. (2006) *Constructions at Work. The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: OUP: