COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AT ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS [*]

UDC 371.3:811.111

Vladan Pavlović

University of Niš, Serbia
E-mail: vladanp2@gmail.com

Abstract. *The paper first shortly presents the basic postulates of cognitive linguistics, including A. Goldberg's construction grammar, as an important theory developing within the cognitive linguistic approach to the grammatical level of language structure. Then it moves on to examine the ways the various theoretical insights of cognitive linguistics can practically be applied to language teaching at English departments, with the focus being primarily on the syntactic and the lexical levels. Apart from the relevant theoretical literature, the paper also builds on the works of various authors who have explored the actual relation between cognitive linguistics and foreign language teaching, and lists and evaluates various ELT books in which cognitive linguistic insights have been put to practice.*

Key Words: *Cognitive linguistics, construction grammar, ELT at English departments, the syntactic level, the lexical level.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper aims to examine some of the ways the various theoretical insights of cognitive linguistics can practically be applied to language teaching at English departments. The focus thereby will primarily be on the syntactic level, especially in view of the fact that the possible applications of the given theory to this level seem thus far not to have attracted researchers' interest to the degree the issue deserves. The possible applications of the given theory to the lexical level will also be dealt with. In connection with this, the paper will, among other things, also list and evaluate some of the (still relatively scarce) ELT books in which cognitive linguistic insights have been put to practice and present an outline of possible future research agenda in the area.

In view of the given aims, here we will first briefly present some of the basic postulates of cognitive linguistics in general (Lakoff/Johnson, 1980; Ungerer/Schmid, 1986; Lakoff, 1987; Langacker, 1987, 1991; Taylor, 1989, 2002). Then we will also focus on A. Goldberg's construction grammar in particular, this being an important theory developing within the cognitive linguistic approach to the grammatical level of language structure.

1.1 One of the most important tenets of cognitive linguistics[1] is that everything in language is permeated with meaning. Meaning, thereby, is considered to be a matter of conceptualization – of how particular language users construe the world anthropocentrically, subjectively and under the influence of a specific cultural surrounding they find themselves in. In that sense, man's conceptual system is postulated to be grounded in his physical experience, ie. conceptual categories, the meanings of words, sentences and other linguistic structures are considered to be motivated, and grounded in one's concrete, direct experience with the surrounding world, with which one interracts through perception, motion, handling different objects, etc. Language is taken to be funadamentally symbolic at all levels of its structure, including the grammatical one. In other words, the basic units of morphology, syntax and lexical semantics are said to form a continuum of symbolic structures, with neither of the levels of linguistic analysis (the phonological, morhological, syntactic ones, etc.) constituting an autonomous part of human language competence, nor is language as a whole taken to represent a separate and unique cognitive faculty. No sharp distinction is drawn between the literal and figurative language, with metaphor and metonymy, as some of the possible modes of figurative thought, consequently being considered one of the crucial traits of human symbolic thought in general. In addition, cognitive linguistics (as opposed to Chomsky's generative grammar) posits no notion of the 'deep structure' nor does it allow for syntactic transformations. Irregularities and idiosyncracies in language use are always taken into consideration, and linguistic meaning and extralinguistic context are thought inseparable. Cognitive linguistics has also come to redifine the concept of categorization (as a (most often) unconscious and automatic language-inherent mental classification process used to reduce the unlimited differences among different entities to a cognitively acceptable level). In that sense, it has put forward the prototype theory of categorization (developed as an alternative to the classical, Aristotelian approch to categorization). In such – cognitive - model, the members of a category can be grouped into prototypes, on the one hand, and those members of a category that more or less aberate from the prototype in a motivated way (via metaphor, metonymy, the principle of family resemblances, gradience, meaning chains, etc.), on the other hand.

---

[1] Suggestions have been put forward (see Antović, 2007:37) that the cognitive linguistics we have in mind here (that usually associated with the names of Lakoff, Langacker and the other authors given above) should be termed *cognitive linguistics in the narrower sense*, the term *cognitive linguistics in the broader sense* being reserved for the entire field of the exploration of not only cognitive linguistics in the narrower sense, but also of Chomsky's generative grammar, Jackendoff's conceptual theory, and other approaches (from variuos scientific disciplines) that explore human cognition. In that sense, when the term cognitive linguistics is used in this paper it will regularly refer to *cognitive linguistics in the narrower sense*.

1.2 In keeping with the aims of the paper presented aboove, here we will also briefly focus on the most important tenets of A. Goldberg's construction grammar (Goldberg 1995 and 2006; Jackendoff 1997; Goldberg/Jackendoff 2002; Östman/Fried 2005).

Namely, this particular theory develops within the cognitive linguistic approach to the grammatical level of language structure, together with Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor's *Unification Construction Grammar*, Langacker's *Cognitive Grammar* [with the capital letters of the phrase] (Langacker 1987, 1991), and Croft's *Radical Construction Grammar* (Croft, 2001). As it would have demanded too much space here to present all these theories developing within cognitive grammar, we have chosen to focus only on the abovementioned A. Goldberg's construction grammar, hoping that, for the purposes of this paper, this theory only will be sufficient to represent some of the basic traits of the cognitive-linguistic approach to the grammatical (and more particularly syntactic) level of language structure (ie. of cognitive grammar) in general.

Construction grammar holds the view that the primary unit of grammar is the grammatical construction, whereby constructions are defined as *symbols*, ie. pairings of form (syntactic, morphological, phonetic form) and content (semantic/pragmatic meaning). All grammatical (ie. morphological and syntactic) constructions can be distributed between the two following pairs of poles. Firstly, there is the substantivity / schematicity opposition. In other words, a construction can be completely lexically filled, ie. substantivized (eg. *It takes one to know one*), or completely schematized (*N1 V N2 N3*), or somewhere in-between the two poles (eg. *The X-er, the Y-er*), with the constructions of the latter two types being, naturally, prone to getting (further) substantivized (eg. *She gave me a book*, *The more, the merrier*, etc.). And secondly, all grammatical constructions can also be distributed between the poles of atomicity and complexity, with monomoprhemic words being considered atomic grammatical constructions, and units such as polymorphemic words, phrases, clauses and sentences getting progressively more complex structurally. In that sense, construction grammar holds the view that the language system can be thought of as a continuum of symbolic structures, along which different constructions can be distributed between the two given pairs of poles. In that way, this theory also tries to realize one of its most important goals – to approach the totality of language without giving greater significance to any of the linguistic levels. An important point emerging from above is that all grammatical constructions, including those completely shematized ones, such as *N1 V N2 N3*, and those partly substantivized and partly schematized one, such as *N1 V time away*, carry meaning in and of themselves (abstract though that meaning may be). Thus the former construction can be ascribed the following meaning: *x causes y to receive z* (eg. *She gave me a book*, *She gave me a headache*), whereas the latter one can be ascribed the following meaning: *x, usually wastefully, spends time doing something* (*He's slept the afternoon away*, *We punk-rocked the night away*, etc.). In other words, the important point the given theory makes is that *a construction can often function as the semantic head of the sentence*. Namely, it stipulates that all concrete instantiations of a particular construction will have certain meaning, regardless of the verb that gets incorporated into it (as we could see from an example pertaining to the latter construction, a verb typically considered an intransitive one, such as the verb *sleep*, can get incorporated into an essentially transitive construction, without there occuring any significant change in the general meaning of the given construction represented above). We will come back to this shortly.

In connection with this, construction grammar also posits various mechanisms pertaining to the ways syntactic constructions, on the one hand, and verbs that integrate into them, on the other hand, interact. In that sense, in order to explore the given kind of interaction, the linguists dealing with construction grammar rely on the concepts such as *construction argument roles*, *verb participant roles*, *role contribution*, *fusion*, *the principle of semantic coherence*, *the principle of correspondence*, *the principle of no synonymy*, *motivation* and some others (eg. see Goldberg, 1995). For limitations of space, in this paper we cannot possibly explain all of these terms but will only focus especially on one of them, namely *motivation* (and partly, *the principle of no synonymy* as well), as it is quite important for our purposes in this paper. We will do so, however, in the following sections of the paper (section 2). In that section, we will discuss the possible applications of the main tenets of cognitive linguistics in general and of and construction grammar in particular to the syntactic level within English language teaching at English departments.

1.3 In section 3, the focus from the same perspective will be on the lexical level. In that sense, we will here first briefly discuss the importance of the concept of *idioms* (in the broader and the narrower sense) and of *idiomaticity* in the given theories, as these particular concepts can be said to form a significant driving force behind these theories in general (see Taylor, 2002:539-560).

Idioms in the narrower sense would be those expressions whose meaning cannot be predicted from the meanings which their component parts have elsewhere in the language, ie. those whose idiomaticity resides in the special meaming that attaches to a syntactically regular phrase (eg. *red herring*, *kick the bucket*, etc.). In addition, idiomatic expressions in the narrower sense may also be those characterized by certain special aspects of the form of those expressions, such as various collocational limitations (eg. one can say *by and large*, but not **by and small*). Idioms in the broader sense would encompass: a) *formulas* – expressions with a conventionalized function in a laguage, which can be conventionally associated with a certain kind of situation (eg. *How do you do?*), or which have a distinctive discourse-structuring function (eg. *to sum up*, *last but not the least*), or which represent conventionalized ways of expressing a speaker's attitude (eg. *Is that a fact?*); b) *pre-formed language*, such as texts and texts fragments (eg. memorized religious texts, nursery rhymes, song lyrics etc.), proverbs, sayings and aphorisms (*make hay while the sun shines*), and cathchphrases and cliches (eg. *It ain't over till the fat lady sings*). A language, naturally contains many (tens of) thousands of expressions of that kind.

In addition to this, construction grammar (and cognitive grammar in general) attempts to show that idiomaticity is an all-pervasive feature of language, ie. that even those categories considered to be rule-governed and non-idiomatic actually display irregularities, idiosyncracies and a smaller or larger degree of idiomaticity. For example, at the morphological level, it can be taken to be an idiomatic fact in English that only the noun *arrogance*, rather than the nouns such as **arrogantness*, **arrogancy*, etc., can be derived out of the adjective *arrogant*. At the syntactic level, the following example could be given. Monotransitive constructions can be said to be typically used to express an event whereby the subject referent causes the object referent to change its state or position. (especially with the verbs such as *kill*, *kick*, *push* etc.). No such relation between the subject and the object referent, however, is expressed in those monotransitive constructions in which the verbs of perception and cognition (eg. *see*, *hear*, *remember*) are used (eg. *I saw*

her in the street yesterday), and especially not in those monotransitive constructions where the subject referent actually expresses the (spatial or temporal) location of an action (eg. *This tent sleeps six*, *The fifth day saw our departure*, etc.). In that sense, the monotransitive construction can be said to have a prototypical centre, and the periphery also characterized by varying degrees of idiomaticity.

In that sense, rather than considering idioms and idiomaticity to be periphreal in language, constructions grammar considers them to actually be *at the core* of it, and a person's knowledge of a language to consists precisely of the knowledge of idioms in the broader and narrower sense (ie. constructions/symbols), and of other various idomatic / idiosyncratic facts related to the use of the various categories of a given language. It is precisely against this background that construction grammar puts forward the above-mentioned view that the distinction between the lexicon (often considered to be the repository of the particular and idiosynratic) and syntax (often considered to be the domain of the regular and predictable) can not be maintained, and that both these levels can actually be thought of as inextricably linked through the above-mentioned concept of constructions/symbols, as form-meaning correspondences, which, naturally, also encompass idioms as defined above. We will come back to this, as mentioned above, in section 3.

2. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS – THE SYNTACTIC LEVEL

In this part of the paper, we will, for limitations of space, focus only on two relevant points from among those mentioned above – the concept of motivation and the concept of sentence argument structure.

2.1.1 In linguistic theory, cognitive linguistics included, the term *motivation* is ascribed at least two senses. First of all, it can be used to refer to different ways that various linguistic constructions can be systematically related to each other(s). And secondly, it can be used to address the question why it is possible or natural that a particular form-meaning correspondence (ie. a paritcular grammatical or any other linguistic construction) should exist in a particular language. We will focus on both of these senses in turn.

As far as the first above-mentioned sense of the concept of motivation is concerned, construction grammar posits various types of *inhereitance links* that different types of constructions can be said to be systematically related by. In other words, the introduction of the concept of inheritance allows us to capture the fact that two constructions can be in some ways the same and in some ways different (Goldberg, 1995:72). The following types of inheritance links are posited: a) metaphorical links, b) subpart links, c) polysemy links, and d) instance links. Once again having the limitations of space in mind, here we will concentrate only on the first types of inheritance links - the metaphorical ones.

In keeping with the cognitive linguistic theory in general, construction grammar, too, insists on the importance of the notion of metaphor. Assuming that the reader of these lines is acquainted with at least the basics of the conceptual theory of metaphor as propounded eg. in Lakoff/Johnson, 1980, or Lakoff, 1987, to name but two relevant sources on the issue, here will will not go into details of the given theory, but will only give several examples that may show how various linguistic structures / constructions can be related through metaphor.

Construction grammar posits metaphoric extension of meaning both between /among constructions that have the *same* form and those whose forms are *different*. An example

of a metaphoric extension of meaning beween two constructions with the same form would be the following pair of sentences: *John gave Mary an apple* and *I'll give you that assumption* (both of which are ditransitive constructions, ie. constructions with the following formal structure: *N1 V N2 N3*). In this particular case, the transfer of abstract ownership, such as that of giving somebody an assumption, is, as it can be seen, conceptualized in terms of a quite concrete, physical transfer, such as that of giving somebody an apple. In other words, one can postulate the existence of the following metaphor here: TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP IS PHYSICAL TRANSFER. Metahoric extensions of meaning of this kind have been extensively discussed in the relevant literature.

Metaphoric extensions of meaning can also be posited between/among construction that have different forms – an issue much less explored in the relevant literature on the topic. We will cite two sets of examples for this here. Let us first take a look at the following pair of sentences (Goldberg, 1995): *She brushed the dirt out of her hair* and *Manchester College elected him Principal in 1956*. Although both of these sentences are complex-transitive, they are once again different in form – in the first one (considered to be an instantiation of the 'caused motion construction') the direct object (DO) is followed by a prepositional phrase (PP) functioning as a complementing adverbial, whereas in the second one (also referred to as the 'resultative construction'), the DO is followed by a noun functioning as an objective complement (OC). The two sentences can be said to be related through metaphor THE CHANGE OF STATE IS THE CHANGE OF LOCATION; in other words, the change of an abstract state, such as that when one becomes a principal, is claimed to be conceptualized similarly to the conceptualization of a change of physical location.

Let us now also consider the following pairs of sentences: *We found the children undernourished* and *We found the children to be undernourished*, *He declared the meeting official* and *He declared the meeting to be official*, *They got him angry* and *They got him to be angry*, *Mary doesn't think he'll leave until tomorrow* and *Mary thinks he won't leave until tomorrow*, *Harry is not happy* and *Harry is unhappy*, *I taught Greek to Harry* and *I taught Harry Greek*, *Sam killed Harry* i *Sam caused Harry to die*, etc.; Lakoff/Johnson, 1980:130/131). As it can be seen, the sentences in each of the given pairs are also formally different - the first one in each of the pairs has the following structure: N V DO OC, whereas in the second sentence in each of the pairs the DO is followed by a complementing adverbial in the form of a non-finite *to*-infinitive nominal clause. In their discussion of the given examples, Lakoff and Johnson in their abovementioned book from 1980 say that the sentences in each of the pairs can be related through the metaphor CLOSENESS IS STRENGTH OF EFFECT. Namely, depending on whether the DO is closer to the adjective/the past participle that refers back to it (as is the case in the first sentence in each of the pairs) or further apart from it (as is the case in the second sentence in each of the pairs, where the two are separated by *to be*), the meaning changes. In that sense, the first sentence in the first pair is claimed to involve a more *direct* relationship between the subject and object referents and to mean something along these lines: *we encountered the children in that condition*. Conversely, the second sentence in the first pair is thought to imply a more *indirect* relationship between the subject and object referents and to be paraphrasable like this: *we carried out an examination, and that examination revealed the given children's condition*. The following two pairs of sentences can also be approached along similar lines. Namely, in the pair *He declared the meeting official* and *He declared the meeting to be official*, it is the first sentence only (the one where the DO

and the adjective functioning as an OC are closer) that has a prominent performative and resultative force (*the meeting became official / formal as a result of the use of a particular performative speech act on the part of the subject referent*), which does not hold of the latter sentence (that sentence could, for example, be comprehended in this way: *the subject referent consulted a particular relevant legal act and on the basis of that ascertained and publicly declared that the meeting was being held in keeping with the appropriate regulations, and not in some other, possibly illegal way*). The pair of examples: *They got him angry* and *They got him to be angry* could also be claimed to exemplify the same kind of relationship. In other words, it is the first sentence that can be said to express a more direct relation between the subject and the object referent (that sentence could be paraphrased as *They made him angry in spite of himself*), whereas in the second sentence that relation is somewhat more indirect (that sentence could be paraphrased as *They persuaded him to be angry*). All the other examples given above can also be approached similarly.

There are at least two important points that should emerge from the (still quite rudimentary) discussion presented so far in view of the aims of this paper (those primarily relating to the pedagogical implications that the given theoretical views have in the setting described above). First of all, as it could be seen, construction grammar effectively takes the view that the grammatical level of language structure does not represent an unordered list of unrelated data, but a set of argument structure constructions that are tightly connected and intertwined in systematic ways, in a way similar to that of the lexicon.[2] In that sense, directing students' attention to that fact, and especially focusing their attention on the numerous (metaphoric and other) links that can be posited among different constructions, can indeed be expected to facilitate the students' aquisition of various grammar-orineted material, as that material would be presented in a meaningful and logical, systematically structured way. In addition, incorporating the concept of motivation as presented here captures a fundamental structuralist insight which has been overlooked by most formal linguistic theories – the insight that elements in a system influence each other even when they do not literally interact (Goldberg, 1995:72). And secondly, as the examples related to the metaphor CLOSENESS IS STRENGTH OF EFFECT show, students should be made aware of yet another important point construction grammar insists on – the principle that if two constructions are syntactically different (no matter how much related in meaning they may be), then they must also be semantically and/or pragmatically different. This is shown by the examples we have just discussed and has been termed by the given theory *the Principle of No Synonymy*. Yet another example for the same phenomenon would be the following one – the pair of sentences *John gave an apple to Mary* and *John gave Mary an apple*. Namely, the first of them, or more generally, the construction *N1 V N2 N3*, can be said to be used when it is the DO that should be emphasized in the diven discourse, whereas the second construction, or, more generally, the construction *N1 N2 to N3*, can be said to be used when it is the indirect object (IO) that should be given prominence in a discourse. In that sense, it would be quite useful to discuss these and similar types of examples with students, as such discussions, in turn, can

---

[2] In connection with this, it should (once again) be observed that construction grammar is a non-transformational theory - it explores relations between/among constructions that are considered independent, not establishing thereby any asymmetry between/among those constructions that it considers to be related by any of the postulated links; in other words, construction grammar does not consider any construction within a given set of related constructions more basic, and the other one(s) derived from the first.

be expected to facilitate the students' aquisition and use of various construction types, and make them aware of their various interrelations. For a possible way such a discussion may proceed in class the reader us referred to Lakoff/Johnson 1987:126-138.

2.1.2 Yet another sense in which the term motivation is used in cognitive linguistics in general and construction grammar in particular is in the context of providing an explanation as to why it should be possible or natural that a particular form-meaning correspondence (ie. a construction) should exist in a particular language. In that sense, answers to this are in this theory typically sought in discourse requirements, grammaticalization principles, general categorization principles, and the influence of similar factors. We will provide one example for this.

While considering the examples such as *Pat gave and gave but Chris just took and took*, *She could steal but she could not rob*, *Tigers only kill at night*, *Why would they give this creep a low prison term!? He murdered!*, ie. those where the DO is not explicitly expressed, Goldberg (2005:28-32) comes to the following conclusions. Firstly, this type of construction occurs when the DO referent is recoverable from context (as is the case in all the above examples). Secondly, the DO need not be explicitly expressed when it does not have a prominent discourse position, or when that position is occupied by a particular action. A particular action, in turn, can gain a prominent discourse position through its repetitiveness (as in the first example), through contrastive focusing (as in the second example), through its being generic (as in the third example), or when it expresses a strong affective stance, as is the case in the fourth example, as well as under other similar conditions. In short, the DO can be dispensed with in an English sentence if it is easily recoverable from the context or because it is not relevant (ie. does not have a prominent discourse position). This combination of discourse and syntactic traits of the given examples constitutes a possible explanation behind the motivation of the very existence of the construction of the given type, which Goldberg has termed 'the deprofiled object construction' (*ibid.*).

Generally speaking, examples of this sort – those where discourse prominence of a particular sentence element, its semantic predictability and the pragmatic aspects of a construction's use, among other similar factors, play an important role, point to the fact that constructions have clear communicative functions, and that their very existence is motivated rather than arbitrary and *ad hoc*. The implications of such a conclusion for English language teaching should be obvious enough: the students should be made aware of the various, especially pragmatic aspects of the use of various constructions, as such an approach would provide a meaningful context within which various constructions types could be studied and acquired, and as such an approach could provide a possible explanation of the various syntactic and other traits of those constructions.

2.2. As mentioned above, yet another point that we will briefly focus on in this part of the paper and explore its relevance with regard to the aims presented above, is the concept of sentence argument structure. Namely, as we saw before, on the basis of the exampels such as *He's slept the afternoon away*, *We punk-rocked the night away*, *Fred drank the night away*, and the like, construction grammar, due to the resons we talked about, has come to hold the view that a construction (such as the very construction *N1 V time away*) can often function as the semantic head of the sentence. To rephrase what we also said above, construction grammar takes the position that constructions themselves are ca-

pable of contributing meaning not present in the individual words found in them, ie. that sentence argument structure need not always be determined by the main verb (such as the verbs *sleep*, *punk-rock* or *drink* in the above examples), but sometimes (at least partly) by the construction itself (Jackendoff, 1997). In that sense, we consider it to be fruitful to discuss this particular point with students, and especially to have them compare this particular theoretical stance with that, for example, held by structuralism (that many contemporary descriptive grammars students use rely on), or generative grammar, as raising students' theoretical awareness of the various linguistic issues they come across in their studies, and equipping them with the ability to discuss various theoretical models and compare those models in an informed way, can also doubtlessly increase their linguistic competence.

3. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS – THE LEXICAL LEVEL

In this part of the paper we will briefly consider the relevance of the most important tenets of cognitive linguistics presented above for the study of the lexical level of language structure at English departments. In that sense, there are several concepts mentioned above in part 1 that deserve to be addressed here – primarily the concept of idioms (in the narrower and broader sense), and the notion of the metaphoric extension of meaning.

As explained above, construction grammar insists on the existence of a large number of constructions as symbolic units. The implications of such a standpoint in view of our purposes in this paper should be obvious. In the words of Taylor, "once the basic syntactic structures and the inflection classes of a language have been mastered, intermediate and advanced learners of language do not need any further instruction in formal aspects of the language, or even in vocabulary acquisition; what they need is to extend their knowledge of idioms. What marks a proficient second or foreign language speaker is their command of idioms and other foxed expressions" (Taylor, 2002:542). In connection with this, it could be argued that any professional teaching English doubtlessly already attempts to introduce his students to various idioms in the narrower and broader sense and to their use. In that sense, the purpose of our presentation of the view that cognitive grammar takes on the issue is to provide a theoretical justification for an even greater focus on idioms in the setting described above.

Yet another concept we introduced above when we presented the main tenets of cognitive linguistics, the one very closely related to the concept of idioms (and the concept of linguistic motivation), is that of metaphorical extension of meaning. In that sense, we would like to briefly present primarily some relevant practice reference books that can be very useful in view of the goals of this paper presented above.

One such book would be *Idioms Organizer: Organized by Metaphor, Topic and Key Word* by J. Wright (Wright, 1999). At the very beginning, and after briefly presenting the basics of the concept of metaphor, the given book argues for the importance of idioms, and of metaphors they are often based on. It does so by stressing these important points: a) that it is impossible to speak, read or listen to English without meeting idiomatic language, ie. that all native speaker English [or Serbian, or any other other language for that matter] is idiomatic, this being the result of the way the human brain functions; b) that very often the metaphorical use of a word is more common than its literal use, for exam-

ple, we may talk about *ploughing fields*, but we can also, often more frequently, talk about *ploughing through a long novel or report*, *ploughing money into a business*, *ploughing profits back into a company*, *a lorry ploughing into a row of parked cars*, etc.; in all of these cases, the literal meaning may create a mental picture, which, in turn, makes the other meanings easier to understand; and c) that it may be fun to be made aware of the existence and very broad (ie. not just literary) use of metaphor in language; because there is so much to learn, this book argues, anything that helps one remember things is important, and if the language that one is learning is more colourful and interesting, there is more chance that one will remember it. In that sense, this book, suited to intermediate and advanced students, then presents a total of over one hundred units containing plenty of exercises exploring metaphor-based idioms (approximately 1800 of them) in various areas (related to health, holidays, moods, time, business, life, economics, etc.), and thereby showing how those various abstract concepts are conceptualized in terms of more concrete notions, such as those of war, journey, etc. A very similar approach is also taken in the two following practice books that we also recommend: *Word Power: Phrasal Verbs and Compounds. A Cognitive Approach*, by B. Rudzka-Ostyn (Rudzka-Ostyn, 2003) and *Meanings and Metaphors: Activities to Practise Figurative Language*, by G. Lazar (Lazar, 2003). It is also interesting to notice that the same insistance on the notion of metaphor and figurative language can now be seen even in reference books such as dictionaries, in which sense we would like to mention the dictionary entitled *Macmillan Phrasal Verbs Plus*, edited by M. Rundell (Rundell, 2005).

As opposed to the syntactic level of language structure, addressed above, the lexical level of language structure has received much more attention in the relevant literature (as also indicated above). In that sense, we can cite here the following sources, which do not only provide a theoretical background for the application of the cognitive linguistic postulates in an ELT classroom at English departments, but also give much useful advice on the practical applications of those postulates at the given linguistic level (eg. in the study of prepositions, particles, and other lexical categories), and present the results of experiments comparing students' aquisition of various lexical items when the this level of language structure is approached from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, on the one hand, and when the same material is approached from the perspective of other theories, on the other hand. Those sources, among others would be the following ones: Boers/Demecheleer, 1998; Boers, 2000; Deignan A. et al., 1997; Lazar, 1996; Mac Lennan, 1994; Ponterotto, 1994, Achard/Niemeier (eds), 2004; Kristiansen, G. et al. (eds) (2006).

Eventually, we would like to mention several *textbooks* in cognitive linguistics that contain useful practical exercises (naturally, related not only to the lexical but also to the other levels of language structure), which can also be profitably used for the purposes of teaching English at English departments. Some of such textbooks would be the following ones: *Cognitive English Grammar (Cognitive Linguistics in Practice)* by G. Radden and R. Dirven (Radden/Dirven, 2007), *Cognitive Grammar* by J.R. Taylor (Taylor, 2002), and *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics* by Ungerer and Schmid (Ungerer/Schmid, 1996).

4. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the arguments presented above, we believe that it could be argued that cognitive linguistics in general and construction grammar in particular can potentially

serve various fruitful purposes in English language teaching at English departments. First of all, they can increase students' motivation for studying various language materials through organization of those materials into wholes structured on the basis of the insights of the cognitive linguistic theory, with the added benefit that such organization of teaching materials can also be beneficial to retention (positive results of language instruction based on cognitive linguistics, as mentioned above, were proved in a series of controlled experiments, see eg. Boers, 2000; Boers/Demecheleer, 1998; Kövecses/Szabó, 1996). Secondly, they can provide a meaningful context for the students' aquisition of particular construction types through the discussion focusing on various syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of the use of those constructions, as well as on the various metaphoric and other relations that exist between/among those constructions, and the various communicative functions different types of constructions are used for. Thirdly, they can provide the students with possible theoretically grounded explanations of the extension of meaning in (the English) language. Fourthly, they can also provide the students with a theoretical basis for comparing and contrasting the metaphoric (and metonymic) extensions of meaning, and the organization of various lexical, grammatical (and other linguistic) categories of the English language, on the one hand, with the same phenomena in the students' mother tongue(s) and other languages they might speak, on the other. Fifthly, the given theories can be used to help focus the students' attention on the manipulative potential of the metaphor. Eventually, they can also help ELT profesionals develop a critical and creative attitude towards the already existing teaching materials and towards the possible ways of the in-class presentation and use of those materials. Possible future perspectives and research agenda in the area would include conducting large scale longitudinal experiments on the effectiveness of language instruction inspired by cognitive liguistics and, on the basis of the results obtained from those experiments, working on more thorough integration of various theoretical cognitive-linguistic insights into language teaching curricula.

REFERENCES

1. Achard, M., Niemeier S., (eds.), (2004), *Cognitive Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, and Foreign Language Teaching*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.
2. Antović, M., (2007), "Half a Century of Generative Linguistics – What has the Paradigm Given to Social Science?", *Facta Universitatis*, Series Linguistics and Literature, Vol. 5, Nº 1, pp. 31-46.
3. Boers, F., Demecheleer, M., (1998), "A Cognitive Semantic Approach to Teaching Prepositions". *English Language Teaching Journal*. 53:197-204.
4. Boers, F., (2000), "Matephor Awareness and Vocabulary Retention". *Applied Lingustics*, 21:553-571.
5. Croft, W., (2001), Radical Construction Grammar – Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective. Oxford: OUP.
6. Deignan A. et al., (1997), "Teaching English Metaphors Using Cross-linguistic Awareness-raising Activities", *ELT Journal*, vol. 51:4, 352- 360.
7. Goldberg, A., (1995), Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
8. Goldberg, A., (2004), "Argument Realization: The Role of Constructions, Lexical Semantics and Discourse Factors" in: Östman, J., Fried M., (eds.). *Construction Grammars: Cognitive Grounding and Theoretical Extensions*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. p. 17-43.
9. Goldberg, A., (2006), *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford University Press Inc., New York.
10. Goldberg, A., Jackendoff R., (2004), "The Resultatives as a Family of Constructions". *Language* 80(3).
11. Jackendoff, R., (1997), "Twistin' the Night Away", *Language* (13). p. 534-549.

12. Kövecses, Z., Szabó P., (1996), "Idioms: A View from cognitive Semantics". *Applied Lingustic*s. 17:326-355
13. Kristiansen, G. et al. (eds.), (2006), *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.
14. Lakoff, G., Johnson M., (1980), *Metaphors We Live By*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
15. Lakoff, G., (1987), Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
16. Lakoff, G., (1993), 'The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor'. *Metaphor and Thought* (Ortony, A., ed.). p. 202-251.
17. Langacker, R. (1987), Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. I: Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
18. Langacker, R., (1991), Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. II: Descriptive Application. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
19. Lazar, G., (1996), "Using figurative language to expand students' vocabulary", *ELT Journal*, vol. 50:1, 43-51.
20. Lazar, G., (2003), Meanings and Metaphors: Activities to Practise Figurative Language. CUP, Cambridge.
21. Mac Lennan, C., (1994), "Metaphors and prototypes in the learning and teaching of grammar and vocabulary", *International review of Applied Lingusitics,* XXXII/1:97-110.
22. Östman, J., Fried M. (eds.), (2004), *Construction Grammars: Cognitive Grounding and Theoretical Extensions.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
23. Ponterotto, D., (1994), "Metaphors we can learn by". *ET Forum,* vol. 32:3, p. 2-8.
24. Radden, G., Dirven R., (2007), *Cognitive English Grammar (Cognitive Linguistics in Practice)*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
25. Rudzka-Ostyn, B., (2003), *Word Power: Phrasal Verbs and Compunds. A Cognitive Approach*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.
26. Rundell, M. (ed.), (2005), *Macmillan Phrasal Verbs Plus*. Macmillan, Hamshire.
27. Taylor, J.R., (1989), Linguistic Categorization - Prototypes in Linguistic Theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
28. Taylor, J.R., (2002), *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford University Press Inc., New York.
29. Ungerer, F., Schmid H., (1996), *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*, Longman, London.
30. Wright, J., (1999), *Idioms Organizer: Organized by Metaphor, Topic and Key Word*. Language Teaching Publications, Hove.

KOGNITIVNA LINGVISTIKA I NASTAVA ENGLESKOG JEZIKA NA DEPARTMANIMA ZA ANGLISTIKU

Vladan Pavlović

U radu se najpre ukratko predstavljaju kako osnovni postulati kognitivne lingvitike, tako i konstrukcione gramatike Adele Goldberg, kao važne teorije koja se razvija u okviru kognitivno-lingvitičkog pristupa gramatičkom nivou jezičke strukture. Potom se razmatraju načini na koje se teorijski postulati ovih teorija mogu praktično primeniti u nastavi engleskog jezika na departmanima za anglistiku, pri čemu je fokus prvenstveno na sintaksičkom i leksičkom nivou jezičke strukture. U tom smislu, pored odgovarajuće teorijske literature, u radu se daje pregled izvora koji se bave upravo datom vezom između kognitivne lingvitike i njene praktične primene u nastavi, a daje se i pregled i ocena različite referentne literature vezane za praktičnu primenu kognitivno-lingvitičkih postulata u nastavi jezika.

Ključne reči: *kognitivna lingvistika, konstrukciona gramatika, nastava engleskog jezika, sintaksički/leksički nivo jezičke strukture.*