

德古意特认知语言学研究丛书

COGNITIVE SOCIOLINGUISTICS

LANGUAGE VARIATION,
CULTURAL MODELS,
SOCIAL SYSTEMS

认知社会语言学研究： 语言变体、文化模式和社会系统

Gitte Kristiansen and René Dirven 编

德古意特认知语言学研究丛书

COGNITIVE SOCIOLINGUISTICS

LANGUAGE VARIATION,
CULTURAL MODELS,
SOCIAL SYSTEMS

认知社会语言学研究：
语言变体、文化模式和社会系统

Gitte Kristiansen and René Dirven 编

 上海外语教育出版社
SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS
www.sflep.com

DE
G

De Gruyter Mouton

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

认知社会语言学研究：语言变体、文化模式和社会系统 /

(西) 吉特·克里斯蒂安森, (德) 雷恩·德尔文编.

—上海：上海外语教育出版社，2017

(德古意特认知语言学研究丛书)

ISBN 978-7-5446-5059-5

I. ①认… II. ①吉… ②雷… III. ①认知语言学—研究 IV. ①H0-06

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字 (2017) 第291582号

Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Language Variation, Cultural Models, Social Systems edited by Gitte Kristiansen, René Dirven

© Walter de Gruyter GmbH Berlin Boston. All rights reserved.

This work is a reprint edition of the original work from De Gruyter, *Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Language Variation, Cultural Models, Social Systems*, edited by Gitte Kristiansen, René Dirven and is only intended for sale throughout the People's Republic of China, excluding the territories of Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan. The work may not be translated or copied in whole or part without the written permission of the publisher (Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Genthiner Straße 13, 10785 Berlin, Germany).

本书由德古意特出版社授权上海外语教育出版社有限公司出版。

仅供在中华人民共和国境内 (香港、澳门、台湾除外) 销售。

图字：09-2017-666号

出版发行：上海外语教育出版社

(上海外国语大学内) 邮编：200083

电 话：021-65425300 (总机)

电子邮箱：bookinfo@sflep.com.cn

网 址：http://www.sflep.com

责任编辑：苗 杨

印 刷：上海叶大印务发展有限公司

开 本：700×1000 1/16 印张 34.75 字数 711千字

版 次：2018年6月第1版 2018年6月第1次印刷

印 数：1 500册

书 号：ISBN 978-7-5446-5059-5 / H

定 价：108.00元

本版图书如有印装质量问题，可向本社调换

质量服务热线：4008-213-263 电子邮箱：editorial@sflep.com

出版说明

认知语言学是语言学的一门重要分支学科，自20世纪80年代诞生以来，受到了国际和国内学界的广泛关注。近年来，外教社陆续推出了一系列相关丛书，集中体现了国际、国内的优质研究成果。其中“国际认知语言学经典论丛”收入了Ronald Langacker、Leonard Talmy、Dirk Geeraerts等国际认知语言学领域顶尖学者的经典作品；“外教社认知语言学丛书·普及系列”、“外教社认知语言学丛书·应用系列”则体现了国内学界的最新研究成果。这些丛书因内容权威、见解独到受到了外语界的广泛好评。

在过去几十年中，中国认知语言学研究从最初萌芽到蓬勃发展，逐步走向成熟，形成了系统化、多元化的研究格局，跨学科领域的理论及应用研究都取得了长足进步。为进一步拓宽国内认知语言学研究的视野，方便国内读者查阅和借鉴相关研究成果，我们特地从德古意特出版社近年推出的相关学术图书中精选了7种，组成“德古意特认知语言学研究丛书”，引进出版。丛书汇集了Ronald Langacker、Dirk Geeraerts、René Dirven、Martin Pütz等多位国际认知语言学界权威编著的力作，其中既有关于认知语言学基本理论的必读经典，也有认知语言学与语言习得、语言教学、社会语言学等领域的融合研究，视野广泛，观点新颖，方法多元，文献丰富。

相信本套丛书可帮助广大认知语言学的研习者深入了解认知语言学的理论，把握认知语言学的研究热点和发展趋势，开拓多元化的研究方法思路，进一步推动我国认知语言学研究的长远发展。

Cognitive Sociolinguistics

Language Variation, Cultural Models,
Social Systems

Edited by

Gitte Kristiansen

René Dirven

Acknowledgments

The idea for this volume originated at the 30th International LAUD Symposium, at which some of the present contributions were originally presented. We would like to express our gratitude to all of the contributors for their comprehensive cooperation and for responding with professionalism to all the requests that have been made of them, including extensive reviewing and lengthy processes of refereeing.

Furthermore, our sincere thanks go to the staff at Mouton de Gruyter for handling the manuscript in a most efficient way. Warm thanks go specifically to Anke Beck for helpful advice and for her interest in this project, to Birgit Sievert for her professional expertise and support, and to Wolfgang Konwitschny who guided us through the production process in a very meticulous way.

Table of contents

Acknowledgments	iii
Introduction: Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Rationale, methods and scope	1
<i>Gitte Kristiansen and René Dirven</i>	
Part one: Theoretical aspects: Semantic and lectal variation	
Prototypes, stereotypes, and semantic norms	21
<i>Dirk Geeraerts</i>	
Style-shifting and shifting styles: A socio-cognitive approach to lectal variation	45
<i>Gitte Kristiansen</i>	
Part two: Usage-based variation research	
Methodological issues in corpus-based Cognitive Linguistics	91
<i>Kris Heylen, José Tummers, Dirk Geeraerts</i>	
Channel and constructional meaning: A collostructional case study	129
<i>Anatol Stefanowitsch and Stefan Th. Gries</i>	
National variation in the use of <i>er</i> “there”. Regional and diachronic constraints on cognitive explanations	153
<i>Stefan Grondelaers, Dirk Speelman and Dirk Geeraerts</i>	
Variation in the choice of adjectives in the two main national varieties of Dutch	205
<i>Dirk Speelman, Stefan Grondelaers and Dirk Geeraerts</i>	
Part three: Cultural models of language and language policy	
Rationalist and romantic models in globalisation?	237
<i>Frank Polzenhagen and René Dirven</i>	
A nation is a territory with one culture and one language: The role of metaphorical folk models in language policy debates	301
<i>Raphael Berthele</i>	

Cultural models of Home in Aboriginal children's English	333
<i>Farzad Sharifian</i>	
A Cognitive Linguistic approach to the cultures of World Englishes: The emergence of a new model	353
<i>Hans-Georg Wolf</i>	
Part four: Socio-political systems	
Corporate brands as socio-cognitive representations	389
<i>Veronika Koller</i>	
Metaphorically speaking: Gender and classroom discourse	419
<i>Susan Fiksdal</i>	
The business model of the university: Sources and consequences of its construal	449
<i>Nancy Urban</i>	
Competition, cooperation, and interconnection: 'Metaphor fami- lies' and social systems	483
<i>Pamela S. Morgan</i>	
How cognitive linguists can help to solve political problems	517
<i>Karol Janicki</i>	
Subject index	543

Introduction

Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Rationale, methods and scope

Gitte Kristiansen and René Dirven

1. Why do we need a Cognitive Sociolinguistics?

Nine years ago Langacker (1999: 376) programmatically emphasised the necessity of extending Cognitive Linguistics to the areas of discourse and social interaction:

Articulating the dynamic nature of conceptual and grammatical structure leads us inexorably to the dynamics of discourse and social interaction. While these too have been part of Cognitive Grammar from the very onset, they have certainly not received the emphasis they deserve.

In a similar vein, a series of scholars whose research likewise falls within the discipline of Cognitive Linguistics have in recent years repeatedly advocated the need for approaches which would bring the objects of study and the methodologies employed in sociolinguistics and Cognitive Linguistics closer together, and, more importantly, these researchers have taken important steps in the direction of an empirically validated investigation into the social dimensions of linguistic variation.

At the beginning of the new millenium, in other words, a heightened awareness regarding the social aspects of linguistic variation on the one hand, and the necessity of implementing – even developing – the right methodological tools on the other hand, match an already existing trend of research. For examples of descriptively and methodologically oriented studies, see many of the contributions in Dirven, Frank and Pütz (2003), Dirven (2005), Geeraerts (2005), the theme session on lectal categorization and lectal variation celebrated at ICLC9 in Seoul, and the theme session on Cognitive Sociolinguistics at ICLC10 in Kraków. On a more programmatic level, see Sinha (2007) on language as an epigenetic system, Zlatev (2005) on situated embodiment, Itkonen (2003) on the social nature of the linguistic system, Croft (forthcoming) on social interaction, Verhagen (2005) on the role of intersubjectivity, Harder (2003) and Ber-

nárdez (2008) on typology, variation and cognition. We can thus now rightfully speak of a *Cognitive Sociolinguistics*. This volume testifies of such rich empirical and theoretical work and gives proof of an already vigorous cognitive-sociolinguistic strand inside the wider Cognitive Linguistics paradigm.

Four decades ago, William Labov objected to the term “sociolinguistics” on the grounds that there could surely be no way of doing linguistics which did not at the same time take social dimensions and social variables duly into account. Hence, the new term was thought to be redundant. Yet, from the perspective of Cognitive Linguistics – a model in which *usage-based* and *non-modularity* are key words and which thrives more than most other theories on interdisciplinary research – the inclusion of the term Cognitive Sociolinguistics is far from arbitrary. There are many good reasons why the type of studies included in the present volume should be brought together under the same descriptive heading. Let us mention just a few of them.

In the first place, as we just pointed out, the volume brings together various approaches from a burgeoning – but still fragmented – area of research. As such, it coins at the level of book title what is already a practice in several established schools and, in a less condensed and more scattered manner, in many other academic environments in many parts of the world. The volume will serve to show commonalities between these approaches and help those present and future scholars who embrace a socio-cognitive conception of language to better situate their research and to define their work in more precise terms.

In the second place, the volume – the first to bear the title *Cognitive Sociolinguistics* – contributes to establishing an interdisciplinary link between sociolinguists and practitioners of CL. In fact, we very much hope that the content will be equally appealing to sociolinguists and cognitive linguists. It is not uncommon to engage in conversation at a conference with scholars with a specific interest in cultural linguistics or sociolinguistics and discover that the term *cognitive linguistics* is still strongly associated with first generation (i.e. Chomskyan) cognitivism – and hard as one may try to explain the fact that the two disciplines share little more than the common denominator *cognitive*, these beliefs more often than not turn out to be very deep-rooted. Conversely, those scholars who are anxious to see how social variation is dealt with in grammatical theories that take an inherent interest in cognitive processes and contextualised meaning, and which cannot commit themselves to the Chomskyan belief in the homogeneity of language, have unfortunately so far not had access

to a representative volume. This survey of current research and possible inroads will hopefully serve to bridge the gap.

In the third place, it is firmly believed that Cognitive Linguistics itself will unescapably benefit from turning its attention towards variational and interactionist linguistics. For a start, there is still a widespread tendency within Cognitive Linguistics towards studies based on the written production of standardised varieties, but a truly usage-based Cognitive Linguistics cannot ignore the qualitative and quantitative variation to be found within the standard and non-standard varieties of a language. It cannot afford, in other words, to work around language at the almost Chomskyan level of homogeneous speech communities. A usage-based linguistics takes language as it is actually used by real speakers in real situations in a specific historical moment as the basis of its enquiry. As a logical consequence of this fact, Cognitive Linguistics needs to employ empirical methods capable of dealing in adequate ways with social variation: methods that conform to the traditionally high standards of sociolinguistic research and which are capable of distinguishing between social and conceptual types of variability. As argued by Geeraerts (2005: 168–182), Cognitive Linguistics will not only have to come to terms with the fact that social variation systematically appears in the raw linguistic data brought under scrutiny, but also with the fact that the only way to systematically deal with variation which comprises a variety of different social dimensions inevitably involves a solid, empirical analysis. In short, social implies empirical, and empirical implies social.

Furthermore, it is very natural for a fundamentally usage-based discipline such as Cognitive Linguistics to opt for “context” as a key word. After all, just like sociolinguistics and pragmatics, in part it first saw the light as a recontextualising reaction towards a number of very predominant approaches which were reluctant to see language in terms of a social construct and consider cognition in terms of a capacity grounded in social dimensions. These approaches include generativism as a forceful exponent of such a decontextualising trend, and, in a less prominent but still harmful manner, structuralism. The *langue-parole* dichotomy left room for a certain social conception but not at the intermediate level of lectal variation, where the real variationist dance goes on: that part of the scenario where social identities are enacted and where linguistic variants relate to social variables. That part, in short, which ultimately leads to linguistic change. In structuralism, in broad terms, the leap is directly from individual variation to a societally shared code. It is safe to say that none of the opponents to such trends would object to the claim that

studying real language in use implies a multivariate type of analysis, involving facets such as user-related variation, situationally determined variability and conceptual motivation. Research that endeavours to unravel, examine and compare social and cognitive dimensions can in a most natural way be subsumed under the cover term Cognitive Sociolinguistics.

2. Scope and organisation of the volume

This volume takes a broad and non-exclusive view on Cognitive Sociolinguistics. To that effect, the contributions included exemplify four different and well-defined areas. The main sections included in this volume cover four major areas: 1) theoretical work on fundamental aspects (in this case semantic and lexical variation), 2) usage-based and corpus-based research on language variation, 3) research on cultural models, and 4) ideology research on sociopolitical and socio-economic systems. Let us briefly spell out in full why these areas deserve special attention.

As a usage-based approach to language, Cognitive Linguistics is bound to be open to sociolinguistic problem areas such as regional and social language variation. Up till now in Cognitive Linguistics, grammatical and lexical studies have mainly focused on the conceptual and referential functions of linguistic symbolisation. Cognitive Sociolinguistics intends to extend the cognitive paradigm into the regional and social patterns involved in linguistic symbolisation, to be studied either as a topic in its own right or parallel to conceptual structure. This focus on the way in which language usage in different regional and social groups is characterised by different conceptualisations, by different grammatical and lexical preferences, and by differences in the salience of particular connotations adds a necessary social dimension to the Cognitive Linguistic enterprise. And as a usage-based approach, Cognitive Linguistics has a very natural basis for sharing concerns with Sociolinguistics. To begin with, far from investigating language form independent of context, context, topic and speakers, Cognitive Sociolinguistics naturally puts speakers in their socio-cognitive functioning in the centre of attention. The relationship between society and language has of course been widely examined in the fields of Sociolinguistics and the Social Psychology of Language, but neither discipline has made use of a Cognitive Linguistic explanatory framework. However, it is a working assumption within Cognitive Sociolinguistics that the theoretical framework of CL may serve to 'throw new light on old problems'.

Usage-based variation research is practised, among other centres in the world, by the Leuven school (which implements large corpora and advanced quantitative techniques) and by the group of scholars working around the tools developed by Stefan Th. Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch (i.e. collostructional analysis).

Cognitive Sociolinguistics is also bound to look into the differentiated conceptual links between language and culture, as laid down in the concept of cognitive cultural models, already initiated in cognitive anthropology by Holland and Quinn (1987) with various linguistic contributions, a.o. by Lakoff/Kövecses, Sweetser, and Kay; further, see Palmer (1996). The present volume contributes to this research by focusing on models underlying language policies and their impact in expert analysis (i.e. analyses by linguists) and in folk perception, alike.

Further, the volume also covers the link between language and the sociopolitical and socio-economic ideologies which permeate the institutional systems that channel and dominate society. In this respect, the book continues the line of research initiated by Lakoff, who in an interview with Pires de Olivera (2000: 43–44) was asked about the existence of a Cognitive Sociolinguistics and answered: “There is a cognitive sociolinguistics in existence, in my *Moral Politics*, in Steven Winter’s new book on law and CL, *A Clearing in the Forest*, in the dissertation by Pamela Morgan on political speeches, and in the dissertation by Nancy Urban on business metaphors being used to restructure education.” The latter two researchers contribute to this volume with new research results.

As Lakoff’s answer confirms, he largely identifies Cognitive Sociolinguistics with ideology research, but Cognitive Sociolinguistics comprises much more than that. This volume brings together various major Cognitive Linguistic inroads into the research areas of Sociolinguistics, and as such, it will not only give more substance and weight to Lakoff’s claim, but also widen his view of Cognitive Sociolinguistics considerably.

Now, the broad perspective provided could also easily give the impression that everything that might possibly be included within the confines of Cognitive Sociolinguistics would have the same status within that category. To explain why this is not exactly the case, let us briefly envisage Cognitive Sociolinguistics in terms of a prototype category. As in any other non-classical category, some combinations of features and dimensions are bound to be more central and others more marginal. In this particular case and in the light of the considerations spelled out above, it is safe to say that Cognitive Sociolinguistic research can loosely be characterised as that which a) explores language-internal or cross-linguis-

tic variation of a social origin in its own right or incorporates it into an investigation with other aims, b) draws on the theoretical framework developed in Cognitive Linguistics and c) arrives at its findings by implementing solid empirical methods. The most prototypical contributions will be those that possess all the features of such a combination. Contributions that to varying degrees fail to meet the latter requirement might still be considered as pertaining to the category, but it must not go without saying that they will be much more marginal than those which combine all three characteristics.

3. Overview of the various sections and contributions

3.1. Theoretical aspects: Semantic and lectal variation

The first section explores the necessity of a Cognitive Sociolinguistics from a predominantly theoretical perspective. The social dimensions of semantics and language-internal conceptualisation, it is argued, cannot be neglected in a usage-based model of grammar. Prototype theory, for instance, has been widely accepted and implemented in Cognitive Linguistics, but stereotypicality and normativity have remained as peripheral and ill-defined notions. In the same vein, a number of issues which have traditionally been studied from a sociolinguistic perspective, such as style-shifting and code-shifting, are eminently well-suited for a cognitively oriented type of analysis.

In “Prototypes, stereotypes, and semantic norms”, **Dirk Geeraerts** engages in a comparison of the notions of prototype (Eleanor Rosch) and stereotype (Hilary Putnam) with specific reference to the distribution of meaning within a linguistic community. Geeraerts first argues that prototype-theoretical research should abandon the idea of homogeneous linguistic communities. In the second place, it is observed that the rigid designation and division of linguistic labour associated with Putnam’s theory are logically independent. Hence, the socio-semantic model proposed by Putnam needs to be expanded. The alternative model proposed by Geeraerts involves three types of sociosemantic forces: a semantics of cooperation (underlying prototype-based extensions of meaning as described by Renate Bartsch), a semantics of authority (as in Putnam’s view on the division of linguistic labor), and a semantics of conflict and competition (as when semantic choices are implicitly questioned or explicitly debated).

In “Style-shifting and shifting styles: A socio-cognitive approach to lectal variation” **Gitte Kristiansen** combines variationist and interactionist sociolinguistics (relatively stable speaker-related factors vs. dynamic, situational phenomena) with a series of well-known notions from CL, such as prototype theory and reference point construction, so as to provide a socio-cognitive account of style-shifting. The paper analyses the possible processes and mechanisms by means of which speakers shift towards codes or styles that are different with respect to their own – or form part of their habitual repertoire. The paper progresses in two major steps. Part one centres on the human capacity for accent-based dialect identification and argues that our awareness of linguistic and social categories is experientially grounded and that these are systematically related by means of a metonymic link: LANGUAGE STANDS FOR SOCIAL IDENTITIES. The second part of the paper focuses on a more active type of competence: LANGUAGE IS A TOOL FOR EXPRESSING SOCIAL IDENTITIES.

3.2. Usage-based variation research

Cognitive Linguistics claims to be fundamentally usage-based, but it is often heavy on theory and surprisingly light on method. As Geeraerts (2005) argues, a usage-based linguistics necessarily involves not only a solid empirical method (because it aims at examining actual, non-elicited language behaviour), but also an investigation of the social variation that naturally manifests itself in actual language use, as attested in e.g. large textual corpora.

This section comprises a series of articles by scholars who all employ quantitative corpus analysis in their linguistic research, in accordance with the usually high empirical standards of sociolinguistics. While the first paper serves as a theoretical lead-in by spelling out the intricacies of investigating linguistic variables by means of corpus-based methods and by comparing different methodological approaches, the rest of the chapters are examples of actual case studies based on the use of large textual corpora

The chapter by **Kris Heylen**, **José Tummers** and **Dirk Geeraerts**, entitled “Methodological issues in corpus-based Cognitive Linguistics”, contributes to an ongoing discussion about methodological innovation in Cognitive Linguistics. The authors critically review the methodologically most advanced quantitative case studies of syntactic variation and explore the issues that arise when methodological choices have to be made. The paper compares two schools that both endeavour to develop a meth-

odology for empirical research in Cognitive Linguistics based on quantitative analysis of corpus data: the collostructional approach as adopted by Stefan Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch vs. the methods developed by the research unit Quantitative Lexicology and Variational Linguistics at the University of Leuven, of which the authors form part.

In their chapter, “Channel and constructional meaning: A collostructional case study”, **Anatol Stefanowitsch** and **Stefan Th. Gries** respond to the criticism voiced by Heylen et al. in the previous contribution and provide the reader with a number of case studies to exemplify the extent to which variational dimensions such as channel can be incorporated within a collostructional analysis. On the basis of their findings, they conclude that (i) constructions may display channel-specific associations to individual lexical items, (ii) constructions differ with respect to their channel sensitivity, and (iii) the meaning of a given construction does not vary across channels.

In the chapter “National variation in the use of *er* ‘there’. Regional and diachronic constraints on cognitive explanations”, **Stefan Grondelaers**, **Dirk Speelman** and **Dirk Geeraerts** question the assumption that there should invariably be a one-to-one relationship between linguistic variation and underlying conceptual mechanisms. By means of multivariate and regression analyses, the authors show that the different distribution of ‘er’ (there) in adjunct-initial sentences as manifested in the national varieties of Dutch cannot be attributed to functional differences – in both Belgian and Netherlandic Dutch the same human reference point ability govern the usage of ‘er’ – nor to differences in discursive or syntactic parameters. More plausibly, the authors argue, the cause is related to the delayed linguistic standardisation of Belgian Dutch.

In the last chapter in this section, entitled “Variation in the choice of adjectives in the two main national varieties of Dutch”, **Dirk Speelman**, **Stefan Grondelaers** and **Dirk Geeraerts** exemplify the use of a word frequency list based method for comparing corpora, the *stable lexical marker analysis*, by means of a case study on the choice of adjectives in Netherlandic and Belgian Dutch. The findings reveal robust national differences across registers, and robust register differences across nations. The authors conclude that the method of stable lexical markers is a useful exploratory technique for detecting patterns of variation and for identifying different sources of variation.

3.3. Cultural models of language and language policy

Since Holland and Quinn's (1987) seminal publication, only very few publications have systematically pursued the topic of cognitive cultural models. This section limits itself to cultural models in language and language policies, but as the work represented shows, the heading is still quite broad. Scholars in this section explore cultural models underlying attitudes to global languages or towards the use and instruction of foreign languages, investigate how cultural conceptualisations often live on in a newly adopted language, and discuss the cultural adaptations of various instances of World English.

In their contribution, "Rationalist or Romantic models in globalisation", **Frank Polzenhagen** and **René Dirven** analyse views on global languages from a discourse-analytic and metatheoretical perspective. Learning on Geeraerts (2003), the authors analyse the underlying politico-philosophical positions and conceptions of language in relation to two central competing cognitive cultural models in Western thinking, namely the rationalist model and the romantic model. Polzenhagen and Dirven relate the key arguments made in the debate on global languages to conceptualisations that are characteristic of these two models, in particular to specific metaphoric and metonymic conceptualisations of language, and critically discuss the ideologies inherent in the linguistic reflexes of two models in the current, heated debate on globalisation.

In "A nation is a territory with one culture and one language: The role of metaphorical folk models in language policy debates", **Raphael Berthele** in turn aims at better understanding of the folk cultural models that underlie attitudes towards particular languages. Berthele focuses on two instances of national language ideologies in the Western world: the debates around the use and instruction of foreign languages in the US and in Switzerland. While in the US the contentious issue is whether there is space for more than one official language (namely English), in Switzerland the currently most controversial issue is the space public schooling has to attribute to "non-native" languages, such as English, as opposed to the four national languages. Berthele concludes that the differences in language policy issues cannot simply be boiled down to two or more different choices in metaphors for language. Rather, it is the precise way in which the metaphors are being used which contributes to the opposing ideologies.

The chapter by **Farzad Sharifian**, entitled "Cultural models of Home in Aboriginal children's English" examines the extent to which cultural