Introduction

Laura A. Janda and Tore Nesset

Cognitive linguistics is quickly gaining wide acceptance and popularity in Slavic countries and among Slavic linguists. In the old East Bloc, for example, the so-called generativist revolution did not have the same impact on the development of linguistic theory as it had in the west. Chomsky's works, both political and linguistic, were banned, and linguists worked along in isolation from their peers elsewhere. Prime examples are the "Meaning-Text" framework developed by Russian linguists Mel'ãuk, Zholkovsky and Apresjan, which focused specifically on semantic analysis; and the sustained focus on ideals of Prague-circle structuralism still observable in the Czech Republic. During the post-Cold War era Russian and other East European linguists have discovered that Cognitive Linguistics is more compatible than any other major framework with the theoretical work they did during the iron curtain era (Rakhilina 1998 provides ample proof for this claim). Among Slavic linguists in Western Europe and the USA, the work of Roman Jakobson has been of particular significance. As has been argued by Janda (1993), Cognitive Linguistics is in many ways a continuation of the Jakobsonian tradition; both frameworks assume that the form-meaning relationship plays an essential role, and Jakobson foreshadowed in some sense the structure of the radial category through his use of the "relational invariant" and the dichotomy between unity and diversity via a hierarchical system of relationships. For these reasons, Cognitive Linguistics is of special importance in the Slavic world as well as in the world of Slavic linguistics. This trend is particularly strong in Russia, Poland, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Macedonia, Western Europe and the United States, making it only natural to organize a theme session of Slavic linguistics at the seventh International Cognitive Linguistics Conference, held at the University of California, Santa Barbara, July 2001. All the papers originally drafted for this theme session are included in the present volume, as well as Laura A. Janda's plenary talk given at the conference. Alina Israeli has additionally contributed a paper that was first read at the second annual conference of

the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Association at the University of Virginia in October 2001. The present volume is the first publication that brings together a variety of authors, from a variety of countries, treating a variety of Slavic languages within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics.

How do the Slavic languages differentiate between and encode directionality as opposed to static location? How is the domain of space used to structure Slavs' linguistic understanding of time? What are the roles of nominal categories like case and verbal categories like aspect? What are the contributions of image schemas, conceptual metaphor and semantic networks to the grammars of Slavic languages? The papers in this volume center around one or more of these questions, thus justifying the title "Times and Cases: A View of Slavic Conceptualizations".

Steven J. Clancy's contribution "The conceptual nexus of BE and HAVE. A network of BE, HAVE and their semantic neighbors" opens the volume. As suggested by the title, this paper explores the distribution of BE, HAVE and related concepts. Drawing on data from Russian, Czech, Polish, Bulgarian and other Slavic and Indo-European languages, Clancy advances a kind of semantic network that he refers to as a "conceptual nexus" to handle the variety of both form and meaning. It is argued that as analytical tools in linguistic analysis, the nexus has explanatory power for a wide range of diachronic and synchronic issues related to the categories BE and HAVE. The nexus accounts for the renewal and development of formal expressions for the categories, as well as their grammaticalization, polysemy and suppletion.

In her paper "Putting things in their places in Russian: location or destination?", Alina Israeli discusses the Russian equivalents of English sentences like *He lay down on the floor* and *He hid the book under the pillow*. Each of these English sentences corresponds to two sentences in Russian, one with the accusative case and one involving either the locative or the instrumental. Israeli proposes an account of this case alternation in terms of two image schemas, CONTAINER and PATH. Whenever a PATH is construed as crossing the border of a CONTAINER, the accusative is attested. The locative or instrumental cases are found in cases where no path is involved, or (the relevant part of) the path is inside the container. Drawing on a database of examples from Russian fiction and non-fiction texts, Israeli demonstrates that the various constellations of image schemas relate to a

wide range of semantic and pragmatic factors. Far from being arbitrary, the case alternation under scrutiny is therefore motivated by fundamental constructs in Cognitive Linguistics.

Like Israeli's paper, the notion of directionality is also pivotal in Laura A. Janda's contribution "Because it's there: How linguistic phenomena serve as cognitive opportunities". Analyzing temporal adverbials in various Slavic languages, Janda argues that aspect allows events to be construed as metaphorical objects. According to Janda, these objects are related to the time line in two ways, either as occupying a static location or as moving into a location. These two cognitive strategies correlate with different cases in temporal adverbials in the Slavic languages. However, Janda's paper is not limited to analyzing case in temporal expressions. She also provides a broad analysis of case variation across the Slavic languages, as well as a diachronic analysis of the "recycling" of defunct morphology. Both on the synchronic and diachronic dimensions, much linguistic variation is revealed. Different languages use the same cases differently, and through time new semantic distinctions arise as defunct morphemes come to serve new purposes. However, the variation is neither unlimited nor arbitrary. Janda observes a "drive towards semantic order" which she speculates is "indicative of processes characteristic of human cognition, since language is the most immediate artifact of human cognition available to us for inspection".

The next paper in the volume is "The conceptual network of the possessive *na*-constructions in Macedonian" by Liljana Mitkovska. She argues that the constructions in question constitute a radial category with three central subcategories, which she refers to as "ownership", "kinship" and "physical part/whole relations". Mitkovska identifies several further subcategories, which are analyzed as extensions from the central subcategories. In addition to advancing an analysis of a construction from a language that has not received much attention in cognitive linguistics, Mitkovska also argues two theoretical points. First, she shows that the possessive *na*-constructions are in accord with Langacker's (1993, 2000) reference point model, and thus presents evidence in favor of it. Secondly, Mitkovska considers the radial category from the perspective of grammaticalization and argues that her analysis supports Traugott's (1986, 1988) theory

of a correlation between "degree of subjectification" and a subcategory's position in the network.

Tore Nesset's paper "Case assignment in Russian temporal adverbials: An image schematic approach" is closely related to the contributions of Israeli and Janda in focusing on case assignment. Nesset proposes an account of the alternation between the locative and the accusative in certain Russian temporal adverbials in terms of three image schemas, viz. CONTAINER, POINT and MEDIUM. It is argued that the choice of image schema, and hence case, relates to the lexical meaning of the adverbial's head noun as well as morphological categories and phrasal syntax. Although the choice of case is not always fully predictable on the basis of these factors, it is always **motivated**, and the analysis does not resort to arbitrary indices of any kind. Image schemas are central in several contributions to this volume, and Nesset compares the merits of this notion to those of distinctive features, which have been instrumental in the development of structuralist and generative theories of case. It is argued that image schemas display certain advantages since they facilitate a natural account of the interaction of different properties in the assignment of case. Hence, it is concluded, image schemas are not only cornerstones in a theory of embodied cognition, they also enable the working grammarian to capture descriptive generalizations about individual languages.

Another paper focusing on directionality closes the collection. However, rather than investigating nominal categories like case, Ekaterina V. Rakhilina's paper "There and back: The case of Russian 'go'" addresses the meaning of the Russian motion verb *idti* 'go on foot, walk'. At the center of Rakhilina's analysis is the use of this verb as a "generalized verb of motion", i.e., when *idti* is used to describe vehicles such as ships and trains, which do not actually walk on foot. While the generalized use is widely attested in Russian, Rakhilina argues that it is only possible when the motion in question is goal-oriented. In addition to shedding light on a notoriously complicated area of the Russian language, Rakhilina's analysis also has important typological implications. With regard to Talmy's (2000) well-known distinction between "classifying" and "unitary" languages, Russian is clearly classifying, since it posits different verbs for different manners of motion. However, Rakhilina's analysis indicates that the distinction is simplistic insofar as generalized verbs are possible even in a classifying language. Rakhilina's analysis also

has a bearing on Fillmore's (1966, 1975, 1983) distinction between goal-oriented and source-oriented verbs. While, as mentioned, *idti* involves goal-orientation when used as a "generalized verb", it is argued that the verb is rather neutral or source-oriented when used about locomotion on foot. Hence, Rakhilina's analysis suggests that the classification of a verb as goal-oriented or source-oriented is relative to its use as a generalized or non-generalized verb.

A brief presentation like this obviously does not do justice to the richness and complexity of the six papers that constitute this volume. Hopefully, however, it has served as a tasty aperitif sharpening the reader's appetite for the subsequent meal. Our six-course menu includes papers shedding light on various aspects of conceptualization in a variety of languages. Together they provide converging evidence for a Cognitive Linguistic approach to the Slavic languages.

References

Fillmore, Charles. 1966. "Deictic categories in the semantics of COME." *Foundations of language* 2, 219-227.

Fillmore, Charles. 1975. *Santa Cruz lectures on deixis*. Bloomington: IULC.

Fillmore, Charles. 1983. "How to know whether you're coming or going". In *Essays on deixis,* G. Rauh (ed), 219-227. Tübingen: Narr.

Janda, Laura A. 1993. "Cognitive linguistics as a continuation of the Jakobsonian tradition: The semantics of Russian and Czech reflexives." In *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists in Bratislava,* R.A. Maguire and A. Timberlake (eds), 310-19. Columbus: Slavica.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1993. "Reference-point constructions". *Cognitive Linguistics* 4 (1): 1-38.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2000. *Grammar and Conceptualization.* [Cognitive Linguistics Research 14]. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rakhilina, Ekaterina V. 1998. "Kognitivnaja semantika: istorija, personalii, idei, rezul'taty." In *Semiotika i informatika* 36, V.A. Uspenskij et al. (eds.), 274-323. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. "Lexicalization patterns". In: L. Talmy. *Toward a cognitive semantics*, *vol. II: Typology and process in concept structuring*, 21-146. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1986. "From polysemy to internal semantic reconstruction". *BLS* 12: 539-550.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1988. "Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization". *BLS* 14: 406-416.