Annotated Bibliography—COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS
PREPARED BY VYV EVANS
www.vyvevans.net

INTRODUCTION

Cognitive Linguistics is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of language, mind and socio-cultural experience that first emerged in the 1970s. Cognitive Linguistics is characterised by a commitment to the inseparability of meaning and form in the study of language. It also takes the view that language reflects general aspects of cognition, rather than adopting a modular view of mind. A further feature of the approach is the view that language is best studied in the context of, and indeed emerges from, use. Cognitive linguists have predominantly focused on two general areas of enquiry: the study of language organisation (cognitive approaches to grammar), and language as a means of studying aspects of conceptual structure (cognitive semantics). Cognitive Linguistics is an increasingly influential approach in cognitive science, social science and applied linguistics.

FOUNDATIONAL WORKS

Cognitive Linguistics emerged from research conducted by prominent scholars working on the West Coast of the United States during the 1970s and 1980s. Most notable among these are Langacker (Langacker 1987; Langacker 1991), who developed the theory of *Cognitive Grammar*, Lakoff (Lakoff 1987), who applied work on categorisation to metaphor, lexical semantics and grammar, and Talmy (Talmy 2000), who studied the conceptual basis of grammar. These three researchers are widely considered to be the founding fathers of the enterprise. Also foundational was Lakoff and Johnson 1980, which developed *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*, as well as Johnson's 1987 development of the theory of Images Schemas (*Image Schema Theory*), which grew out of the work on conceptual metaphors. Other important work that has proved to be foundational was developed by Fillmore (Fillmore 1982), on *Frame Semantics*, and Fillmore et al. 1988, which provided the basis for the theory of *Construction Grammar*. Finally Fauconnier 1985 developed the theory of Mental Spaces (*Mental Spaces Theory*), which later gave rise to *Conceptual Integration Theory*.

Fauconnier, G. 1994. *Mental spaces*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
> This work developed a cognitive linguistic approach to meaning construction and discourse semantics. This perspective was foundational for the later development of *Conceptual Integration Theory*. Originally published by MIT Press in 1985.

Fillmore, C. 1982. Frame Semantics. The Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.)., *Linguistics in the morning calm*, pp. 111-137. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.

The best-developed early presentation of Frame Semantics. This has been seminal for encyclopaedic approaches to lexical semantics and the later development of *Construction Grammar*.

Fillmore, C., P. Kay and C. O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity: The case of 'let alone'. *Language*, 64-3: 501-538.
> This paper presents the seminal statement on *Construction Grammar*.

Johnson, M. 1987. *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
> This work developed the theoretical construct of the image schema, one of the most important ideas in Cognitive Linguistics.

Langacker, R. 1987/1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* (volumes I and II). Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
> These volumes developed the foundational assumptions (volume I) and applications (volume II) of the distinctive approach to grammatical structure, representation and meaning that is *Cognitive Grammar*.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
> The seminal application of Rosch's work on categorisation and *Prototype Theory* to linguistic semantics, grammar and metaphor.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
> One of the most influential books in late 20th century linguistics. This work argued for a conceptual basis for metaphor and metonymy, and developed the framework of *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. It was one of the earliest works to argue for an embodied basis for conceptual and linguistic organisation.

Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics* (two volumes). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
> The volume is a collection of seminal articles by Talmy originally published in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, which have been highly influential in the development of Cognitive Linguistics.

TEXTBOOKS

There are several excellent introductory overview textbooks of Cognitive Linguistics. Ungerer and Schmid 1996 is now in its second edition. The most advanced is Cruse and Croft 2004, which reflects the authors own research foci and specialisms. The most comprehensive is Evans and Green 2006, which provides a representative sampling of the state of the art. The

most accessible textbook is Lee 2001. There are also textbooks that introduce topics in language study presented from a cognitive linguistics perspective. These include an introduction to English grammar, Radden and Dirven 2007, and one that deals with linguistic categorisation, Taylor 2003. There is a useful textbook that introduces Langacker's theory of *Cognitive Grammar*. This is Taylor 2002. And finally, there's a textbook that introduces Cognitive Poetics, Stockwell 2002, and one that introduces *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*, Kövecses 2002.

Croft, W. & D. A. Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Particularly good coverage of lexical semantics and constructional approaches to grammar.

Evans, V. & M. Green. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An introduction*. Hillsdale, NJ and Edinburgh: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Edinburgh University Press. The most comprehensive general introduction to the field. Each chapter provides a detailed annotated reading list and exercises. Also includes chapters which compare cognitive linguistic theories with other theoretical frameworks.

Kövecses, Z. 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. A clear and highly accessible approach to metaphor analysis and some of the central aspects of *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*.

Lee, D. 2001. *Cognitive Linguistics: An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. An accessible general introduction, focusing on general ideas rather than detail.

Radden, G., & R. Dirven. 2007. *Cognitive English grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. An accessible introduction to the grammar of English taking a cognitive linguistics perspective.

Stockwell, P. 2002. *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. London: Routledge. A very accessible introduction to cognitive poetics from one of its leading proponents.

Taylor, J. 2002. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. An exceptionally clear and accessible introduction to Langacker's theoretical framework.

Taylor, J. 2003. *Linguistic Categorization (3rd edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. An excellent survey of prototypes, and categories more generally, in various areas of language study, including sound systems, meaning, word structure and syntax.

Ungerer, F. & H.J. Schmid. 2006. *An introduction to Cognitive Linguistics 2ⁿᵈ ed.* London: Pearson ESL.

> Very clear explanations particularly on prototype theory and basic level objects research. The book focuses predominantly on topics in cognitive semantics rather than cognitive approaches to grammar.

GLOSSARY

The Cognitive Linguistics enterprise is rich in terminology. The field currently has one published glossary - Evans 2007.

Evans, V. 2007. *A glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*. Edinburgh and Salt Lake City: Edinburgh University Press/University of Utah Press.

> An alphabetic guide to the key terms in cognitive linguistics, covering all the major theories, approaches, ideas, and many of the theoretical constructs associated with the paradigm.

REFERENCE RESOURCES

Encyclopaedias devoted to the fields of linguistics and cognitive science have entries on Cognitive Linguistics, as well as major topics of study within the paradigm. Among the most comprehensive are Brown 2006, and Nadel 2002. Good single volume encyclopaedias are Hogan 2010, and Wilson and Keitel 1999.

Brown, K. 2006. *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics 2ⁿᵈ ed*. Boston: Elsevier.

> A very broad reference work encompassing 14 volumes, and the first in the field of linguistics to thoroughly exploit multimedia resources.

Hogan, P. C. 2010*. The Cambridge encyclopedia of the language sciences*.

> A comprehensive single-volume work of reference for the language sciences.

Nadel, L. 2002. *Encyclopedia of cognitive science*. Hoboken NJ: Wiley.

> A four volume encyclopaedia providing a comprehensive overview of cognitive science.

Wilson, R., and F. Keil. 1999. *The MIT encyclopedia of the cognitive sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

> An excellent single-volume encyclopaedia of cognitive science.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

There are two electronic bibliographies that are relevant for the paradigm of Cognitive Linguistics. There is one covering Cognitive Linguistics (*Cognitive Linguistics Bibliography*),

and one covering metaphor and metonymy (*Bibliography of Metaphor and Metonymy*). Both are updated annually.

De Knop, S., B. Hampe, R. Dirven & B. Smieja. *Cognitive Linguistics bibliography*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. [http://www.degruyter.de/journals/cogling/detailEn.cfm?sel=cb]
> A fully searchable electronic database with over 7,000 entries covering the paradigm of Cognitive Linguistics. Most entries also include an abstract.

De Knop, S., R. Dirven & B. Smieja. *Bibliography of metaphor and metonymy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> A fully searchable electronic database with over 10,000 entries covering the phenomena of metaphor and metonymy. [http://www.benjamins.com/online/met/]

EDITED COLLECTIONS
There are a number of excellent edited volumes devoted to Cognitive Linguistics. The most comprehensive is Geeraerts and Cuyckens 2007. Other representative exemplars include Fauconnier and Sweetser 1996, Evans and Pourcel 2009, and Janssen and Redeker 1999. The field also boasts two collections of readings, Evans, Bergen and Zinken 2007, and Geeraerts 2006, and a volume dedicated to the methodological frameworks employed, Gonzalez-Marquez et al. 2006.

Evans, V., B. Bergen & J. Zinken. 2007. *The Cognitive Linguistics reader*. London: Equinox.
> A collection of twenty eight classic papers, with an introductory article, which provides a broad overview of the major areas of research in Cognitive Linguistics.

Evans, V. & S. Pourcel. 2009. *New directions in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> A recent collection of papers relating to established topics as well as new directions in Cognitive Linguistics.

Fauconnier, G. & E. Sweetser. 1996. *Spaces, worlds and grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
> An early collection of papers exploring aspects of *Mental Spaces Theory*, cognitive approaches to grammar and *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*.

Geeraerts, D. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic readings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
> A collection of twelve seminal papers by some of the leading figures in Cognitive Linguistics.

Geeraerts, D. and H. Cuyckens. 2007. *The Oxford handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

> This volume consists of forty nine specially-commissioned chapters written by leading experts. The volume is conceived as providing a comprehensive overview of the approaches, theories, methodologies and phenomena that fall under the purview of Cognitive Linguistics.

Gonzalez-Marquez, M., I. Mittleberg, S. Coulson & M. Spivey. 2006. *Empirical methods in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

> A volume of specially-commissioned papers focusing on the range of methodologies employed by and available to cognitive linguistic researchers.

Janssen, T. & G. Redeker 1999. *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, scope and methodology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

> A volume of papers exploring foundational aspects of Cognitive Linguistics, by some of the key figures associated with the field.

JOURNALS

There are two international journals devoted to Cognitive Linguistics, *Cognitive Linguistics*, which is the most established and the more recent *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*. The journal *Language and Cognition* is devoted to the relationship between language and cognition, much of which is concerned with Cognitive Linguistics. There are also three journals which relate to major topics of study within the field, namely *Metaphor and Symbol*, *Metaphor and the Social World* and *Cognitive Semiotics*.

Cognitive Linguistics. Mouton de Gruyter. 1990- [http://www.degruyter.de/journals/cogling/]

> The official journal of the International Cognitive Linguistics Association (ICLA), explicitly focusing on research in Cognitive Linguistics.

Cognitive Semiotics. Peter Lang. 2007- [http://www.cognitivesemiotics.com/]

> An interdisciplinary journal concerning relationship between meaning and the mind. The journal often includes issues and topics of direct relevance to Cognitive Linguistics.

Language and Cognition. Mouton de Gruyter. 2009- [www.languageandcognition.net]

> An interdisciplinary journal relating to the intersection between language and cognitive function. Topics are often of direct relevance to Cognitive Linguistics.

Metaphor and the Social World. John Benjamins. 2011- [http://www.benjamins.com/cgi-bin/t_seriesview.cgi?series=MSW]

A new journal which provides a venue for publication on metaphor in social, communicative and discursive contexts, some of which takes a cognitive linguistics perspective.

Metaphor and Symbol. Taylor and Francis. 1985- [http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/1092-6488.asp]

An interdisciplinary journal publishing work on figurative language and the cognitive processes that underpin the linguistic mechanisms. Publications often take a specifically cognitive linguistic focus.

Review of Cognitive Linguistics. John Benjamins. 2003- [http://www.benjamins.com/cgi-bin/t_seriesview.cgi?series=RCL]

Provides a venue for publication on cognitive Linguistic topics.

COGNITIVE GRAMMAR

Cognitive Grammar is an approach to grammatical structure developed by Ronald Langacker. Langacker 2008, is the most recent and most authoritative overview of the theory. Cognitive Grammar has been applied, in particular, to locative expressions, as exemplified by Lindner 1981, the relation between nominal and clausal structures to the speech event, referred to as grounding in Cognitive Grammar. An exemplar is Brisard 2002. Much work has also been conducted on possessive constructions, for instance Taylor 2001. There has been a considerable amount of work conducted on clause structure, for example Tuggy 1988, including transitivity, Rice 1987, voice, Maldonado 1992, and case markers, Janda 1993. Van Hoek 1997 is an important treatment of anaphora within Cognitive Grammar.

Brisard, F. 2002. *Grounding: The epistemic footing of deixis and reference*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

An important edited collection covering nominal and clausal grounding primarily from the perspective of Cognitive Grammar.

Janda, L. 1993. *A geography of case semantics: The Czech dative and the Russian instrumental*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

A Cognitive Grammar study of case in Slavic languages.

Langacker, R. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

A recent definitive introduction to Cognitive Grammar by the architect of the theory.

Lindner, S. 1981. *A lexico-semantic analysis of English verb-particle constructions with UP and OUT*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego.

A seminal application of Cognitive Grammar to verb particle constructions.

Maldonado, R. 1992. Middle voice: The case of Spanish 'se'. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, San Diego.

A landmark treatment of voice deploying Cognitive Grammar.

Rice, S. 1987. *Towards a cognitive model of transitivity*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, San Diego.

An important treatment of transitivity in Cognitive Grammar.

Taylor, J. 2001. *Possessives in English: An exploration in Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

This volume provides a unitary account of the possessive morpheme, deploying the theory of Cognitive Grammar. A noteworthy feature of the book is that it compares and contrasts Cognitive Grammar with Generative approaches.

Tuggy. D. 1988. Náhuatl causative/applicatives in Cognitive Grammar. In B. Rudzka-Ostyn (ed.), *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*, pp. 587-618. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

A seminal treatment of clause structure by one of the leading exponents of Cognitive Grammar.

Van Hoek, K. 1997. *Anaphora and conceptual structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Now a classic, the seminal development of anaphora in Cognitive Grammar.

CONSTRUCTION GRAMMAR

The original work on Construction Grammar was developed by Fillmore 1988, and Kay and Fillmore 1999. Another important contribution derives from Lambrecht and Michaelis 1996. However, since Fillmore's seminal work, a number of distinct constructional theories have emerged. These include Cognitive Construction Grammar, as exemplified in Lakoff 1987, and Goldberg 1995, Goldberg 2006, Radical Construction Grammar, Croft 2001, Embodied Construction Grammar, Bergen and Chang 2005, and most recently Sign-based Construction Grammar, Sag 2010.

Bergen, B.K. and N. Chang. 2005. Embodied Construction Grammar in simulation-based language understanding. In J.-O. Östman and M. Fried (eds.), *Construction Grammars: Cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions*. Pp. 147-190. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

The most accessible account of Embodied Construction Grammar.

Croft. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar. Syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

> The definitive treatment of Radical Construction Grammar.

Fillmore, C. 1988. The mechanisms of Construction Grammar. *BLS* 14: 35-55.

> An early treatment of the theoretical apparatus of Construction Grammar.

Goldberg, A. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar approach to argument-structure constructions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

> The classic treatment of Cognitive Construction Grammar.

Goldberg, A. 2006. *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

> A revised and updated account of Cognitive Construction Grammar that focuses on how constructions are acquired and learnt.

Kay, P. & C. Fillmore. 1999. Grammatical constructions and linguistic generalizations: The *What's X doing Y?* construction. *Language* 75-1: 1-33.

> A seminal development of the theoretical architecture of Construction Grammar.

Lakoff, G. 1987. There constructions (case study 3), in *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

> An influential early Cognitive Construction Grammar account.

Lambrecht, K. & L. Michaelis. 1996. Toward a construction-based theory of language function: The case of nominal extraposition. *Language*, 72-2: 215-247.

> An important development of Fillmorean Construction Grammar.

Sag, I. 2010. Sign-based Construction Grammar: An informal synopsis. In I. Sag and H. Boas (eds.), *Sign-based Construction Grammar*, pp. 39-170. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

> A detailed account of Sign-based Construction Grammar.

CONCEPTUAL INTEGRATION THEORY

Conceptual integration, or "blending", is an account of dynamic meaning construction. The standard reference work is provided by the theory's two architects, Fauconnier and Turner 2002. The role of frame structure in giving rise to blends is best exemplified by Coulson 2000. There is now also good ERP evidence for the role of conceptual integration in meaning construction, Coulson and Van Petten 2002. The framework has been applied to literary texts and the staging of such texts, Cook 2010, to rhetoric, Oakley 1998, grammar, Mandelblit 1997, and sign language, Liddell 2000. The framework has also been applied to the

development of material anchors that ground blends, for instance in time-telling, Williams 2005. And finally, the relationship between conceptual integration and figurative language, especially metaphor, has also been explored, Grady, Oakley and Coulson 1999.

Cook, A. 2010. *Shakespearean neuroplay: Reinvigorating the study of dramatic texts and performance through cognitive science.* London: Macmillan.
>   An important contemporary application of Conceptual Integration Theory to the reading and staging of a literary text.

Coulson, Seana. 2001. *Semantic leaps: Frame-shifting and conceptual blending in meaning construction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
>   Now a classic. This work develops a detailed account of the deployment of frame structure in meaning construction, and advances theoretical aspects of Conceptual Integration Theory.

Coulson, S. & C. Van Petten. 2002. Conceptual integration and metaphor: An event-related potential study. *Memory & Cognition* 30: 958-968.
>   Provides some of the first empirical evidence for the role of conceptual integration in meaning construction.

Fauconnier, G. & M. Turner. 2002. *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
>   A classic work. The definitive treatment of Conceptual Integration Theory by the architects of the theory.

Grady, J., T. Oakley & S. Coulson. 1999. Conceptual blending and metaphor. In R. Gibbs and G. Steen (eds.). *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics*, pp. 101-125. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
>   An important paper examining the role of conceptual integration in metaphor, and the relationship between Conceptual Integration Theory and *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*.

Liddell, S. 2000. Blended spaces and deixis in sign language discourse. In D. McNeill (ed.), *Language and gesture*, pp. 331-357. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
>   An application of the conceptual integration framework to the study of signing.

Oakley, T. 1998. Conceptual blending, narrative discourse, and rhetoric. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 9-: 321-360.
>   A seminal treatment of conceptual integration in the study of rhetoric.

Mandelblit, N. 1997. *Grammatical blending: Creative and schematic aspects in sentence processing and translation*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, San Diego.
> An important study of the role of blending in grammatical structure.

Williams, R. 2005. *Material anchors and conceptual blends in time-telling*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, San Diego.
> A study of the role of material anchors in time-telling, deploying the framework of Conceptual Integration Theory.

CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR THEORY

Conceptual Metaphor Theory was developed by Lakoff and Johnson. The definitive treatment is Lakoff and Johnson 1999. An Important theoretical advance concerns the theory of primary metaphors, Grady 1997, as well as the extension to work on conceptual metonymy, Kövecses and Radden 1998. It has been applied to an extremely wide range of areas including the study of poetics, Lakoff and Turner 1989, language change, Sweetser 1990, political science, Lakoff 2003, discourse, Musolff and Zinken 2009, and gestural studies, Cienki and Müller 2008. An influential study examining the empirical foundation for the theory is Gibbs 1994.

Cienki, A. & C. Müller. 2008. *Metaphor and gesture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> A collection of papers relating to the interdisciplinary study of metaphor and gesture.

Gibbs, R. 1994. *The poetics of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
> Provides a review of empirical evidence (up until the mid 1990s) in favour of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. This work was also important in the development of the study of metonymy as a conceptual phenomenon.

Grady, J. 1997. *Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary* scenes. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
> Develops the theory of primary metaphors, an important advance in Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

Kövecses, Z. & G. Radden. 1998. Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic view. *Cognitive Linguistics* 9(1): 37-77.
> A seminal development of metonymy as a conceptual phenomenon, broadly situated within a Conceptual Metaphor Theory perspective.

Lakoff, G., 2002. *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think* (2nd edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
> An application of Conceptual Metaphor Theory to political thought.

Lakoff, G., & M. Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought.* New York: Basic Books.

> The most recent, and definitive account of Conceptual Metaphor Theory by the theory's two architects.

Lakoff, G. & M. Turner. 1989. *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

> A seminal work that developed the field of cognitive poetics by applying Conceptual Metaphor Theory to literary analysis.

Musolff, A. & J. Zinken. 2009. *Metaphor and discourse.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

> A collection of papers deploying the construct of conceptual metaphor in discourse analysis.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

> A seminal account of the role of conceptual metaphor in aspects of language change.

FRAME SEMANTICS

Frame Semantics evolved from Fillmore's original work on Case Theory, Fillmore 1968. While Fillmore worked on the theory of Frame Semantics in the 1970s, the two best-developed accounts appeared in the 1980s: Fillmore 1982, and Fillmore 1985. Since then the details of Frame Semantics have been worked out in a number of contexts, including from the perspective of lexicography, Fillmore and Atkins 1992, and more recently, in terms of computational implementation under the guise of the **FrameNet** project. The architecture for FrameNet is presented in Boas 2005, its tagset is discussed by Johnson and Fillmore 2000, and the structure of its database is discussed in Baker et al. 2003.

Baker, C., C. Fillmore & B. Cronin. 2003. The Structure of the FrameNet database, *International Journal of Lexicography*, 16.3: 281-296.

> Provides an overview of the structure of the FrameNet database.

Boas, H. 2005. From theory to practice: Frame Semantics and the design of FrameNet. In Langer, S. and D. Schnorbusch (eds.), *Semantisches Wissen im Lexikon*, pp. 129-160. Tübingen: Narr.

> An overview of the rationale for and architecture of FrameNet.

Fillmore, C. 1968. The case for Case. 1968. In E. Bach and R. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*, p. 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

> The classic paper on Case Grammar.

Fillmore, C. 1982. Frame semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Seoul, Hanshin Publishing Co., 111-137.
> A seminal account of the theory of Frame Semantics.

Fillmore, C. 1985. Frames and the semantics of understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica*, 6.2: 222-254.
> An account of the development of Frames Semantics, and how it arose from Case Grammar.

Fillmore, C. & B. Atkins. 1992. Towards a frame-based lexicon: The case of RISK. In A. Lehrer and E. Kittay (eds.), *Frames and fields*, pp. 75-102. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
> A detailed lexicographic analysis of RISK from a Frame Semantics perspective.

FrameNet[www.framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu].
> The FrameNet website. Includes the FrameNet data as well as an online book describing the project, and a full listing of Frame Semantics resources

Johnson, C. & C. J. Fillmore. 2000. The FrameNet tagset for frame-semantic and syntactic coding of predicate-argument structure. In Proceedings of the 1st Meeting of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 56-62 (ANLP-NAACL 2000)
> Presents details of the tagging procedures for implementation of the FrameNet database.

IMAGE SCHEMA THEORY

The theoretical construct of the image schema was developed by Johnson 1987. The most detailed treatment of a single image schema is Cienki 1998, and there is empirical evidence for the existence of image schemas found in Gibbs and Colston 1995. It has been claimed that image schemas form the basis for conceptual metaphors (Lakoff 1993), and that they underpin lexical categories (Lakoff 1987). Moreover, it is argued that they are foundational for conceptual development more generally (Mandler 2004). Clausner and Croft 1999 examine image schemas in relation to conceptual domains, while Palmer 1996 applies image schemas to cultural analysis. Finally, an extremely useful collection, which surveys perspectives on image schemas, is Hampe 2005.

Clausner, T. & W. Croft. 1999. Domains and image schemas. *Cognitive Linguistics* 10: 1-31.
> Compares and contrasts the theoretical constructs of image schemas and domains.

Cienki, A. 1998. STRAIGHT: An image schema and its metaphorical extensions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 9: 107-149.
> A detailed, and important, study of a single image schema.

Gibbs, R., & H. Colston. 1995. The cognitive psychological reality of image schemas and their transformations. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 6, 347-378.
> Provides empirical evidence for the existence of image schemas.

Hampe, B. 2005. *From perception to meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
> An influential collection of papers from leading researchers whose work bears on image schemas.

Johnson, M. 1987. *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
> The book that introduced and developed the notion of image schemas.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
> Applies Image Schema Theory to lexical representation in a detailed analysis of the lexical category *over* (case study number 2).

Lakoff, G. 1993. The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd edition), pp. 202-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
> This paper, among other things, argues that image schemas provide the basis for abstract metaphorical concepts, a procedure captured in Lakoff's famous Invariance Principle.

Mandler, J. 2004. *The foundations of mind: Origins of conceptual thought.* Oxford: Oxford.
> A leading developmental psychologist presents her empirical research which argues for mage schemas as providing the bedrock of a child's conceptual thought during the first year of life.

Palmer, G. 1996. *Toward a theory of cultural linguistics.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
> Develops an influential approach to linguistic anthropology informed by imagery and image schemas.

LCCM THEORY [The Theory of Lexical Concepts and Cognitive Models]

The basis for LCCM Theory lies in the methodological approach to lexical representation pioneered in spatial semantics by Tyler and Evans 2003, and in the domain of time by Evans 2004. The theoretical architecture of LCCM Theory is developed in Evans 2009, and its application to figurative language and abstract thought is worked out in Evans 2010.

Evans, V. 2004. *The structure of time: Language, meaning and temporal cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

> Develops a methodology for lexical semantic analysis in the domain of time that
> provides the basis for lexical analysis in LCCM Theory.

Evans, V. 2009. *How words mean: Lexical concepts, cognitive models and meaning construction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

> Provides the definitive overview of the rationale for and architecture of LCCM Theory.

Evans, V. 2010. Figurative language understanding in LCCM Theory. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 21-4: 601-662.

> Applies LCCM Theory to analyses of metaphor and metonymy.

Tyler, A. & V. Evans. 2003. *The semantics of English prepositions: Spatial scenes, embodied experience and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

> The definitive work deploying the Principled Polysemy lexical analysis methodology.
> This provides the basis for lexical concept identification methodology deployed in
> LCCM Theory.

MENTAL SPACES THEORY

The definitive statement on Mental Spaces Theory is Fauconnier 1994. Dinsmore 1987 argues for the role of mental spaces in reasoning. Cutrer 1994 applies Mental Spaces Theory to tense and aspect, while Dancygier and Sweetser 2005 apply it to conditionals. Fauconnier 1997 develops Mental Spaces Theory in anticipation of the development of Conceptual Integration Theory. Mok et al. 2004 is a computerised implementation of Mental Spaces Theory. Oakley and Hougaard 2008 provides a collection of important papers relating to Mental Spaces Theory by leading proponents.

Cutrer, M. 1994. *Time and Tense in Narrative and in Everyday Language.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, San Diego.

> Provides a mental spaces treatment of tense and aspect.

Dancygier, B & E. Sweetser. 2005. *Mental spaces In Grammar: Conditional Constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Provides an account of the role of mental spaces in grammatical organisation with a detailed study of a range of conditional constructions.

Dinsmore, J. 1987. Mental spaces from a functional perspective. *Cognitive Science*, 11-1: 1-21.

A seminal paper that argues that mental spaces facilitate a process termed 'simulative reasoning'. This provides a forerunner of the development of *Conceptual Integration Theory*, by deploying the architecture of Mental Spaces Theory.

Fauconnier, G. 1994. *Mental spaces*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

First published in 1985, this book introduces the rationale and architecture of Mental Spaces Theory. The 1994 edition of the book features a new introduction and foreword.

Fauconnier, G. 1997. *Mappings in thought and language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Updates and extends Mental Spaces Theory, including the development of Conceptual Integration Theory.

Mok, E, J. Bryant & J. Feldman. 2004. Scaling understanding up to mental spaces. In R. Porzel (ed.)., *Proceedings of 2nd Workshop on Scalable Natural Language Understanding* (ScaNaLU-2004), pp. 41-48., East Stroudsburg, PA: Association for Computational Linguistics.

A computational implementation of Mental Spaces Theory within the Embodied *Construction Grammar* framework.

Oakley, T & A. Hougaard. 2008. *Mental spaces in discourse and interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

An important collection of papers relating to work applying Mental Spaces Theory, and *Conceptual Integration Theory*, to the study of discourse.

PROTOTYPE THEORY

Prototype Theory arose during the 1970s from experimental findings associated with Rosch 1978. It was famously developed and applied to language science by Lakoff 1987. Geeraerts 1997 applies Prototype Theory to lexicography, while Tyler and Evans 2001 is a detailed application to lexical semantics. Lakoff and Kövecses 1987 apply the notion of prototypes to metaphor, while Peirsman and Geeraerts 2006 apply it to metonymy. Wierzbicka 1990 provides a critique of the way in which prototypes are made use of in language studies.

Geeraerts, G. 1997. *Diachronic prototype semantics: A contribution to historical lexicology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

    An important study which examines the role of prototypes in word change.

Lakoff, G., 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

    The classic book that developed and applied Prototype Theory to language and thought.

Lakoff, G. & Z. Kövecses. 1987. The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (eds.), *Cultural models in language and thought*, pp. 195-221 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

    The seminal application of prototypes to conceptual metaphor.

Peirsman, Y. & D. Geeraerts. 2006. Metonymy as a prototypical category. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17-3, 269–316.

    This paper develops a prototype perspective on metonymy, which is argued to be structured in terms of contiguity.

Rosch, E. 1978. Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. Lloyd (eds.) *Cognition and categorization*, pp. 27-48. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

    An influential review article covering much of Rosch's work in relation to prototypes, and a revision to her previous development of Prototype Theory.

Tyler, A., & V. Evans. 2001. Reconsidering prepositional polysemy networks: The case of 'over'. *Language*, 77-4: 724-765.

    An influential study in spatial semantics, deploying the notion of a prototype.

Wierzbicka, A. 1990. Prototypes save: On the uses and abuses of the notion of 'prototype' in linguistics and related fields. S. Tsohatzidis (ed.), *Meanings and prototypes: Studies in linguistic categorization*, pp. 347-367. London: Routledge.

    A critique of the use of the notion of prototypes in linguistic analysis and theory-construction.

USAGE-BASED APPROACH TO LANGUAGE LEARNING

Usage-based approaches to language learning have focused on the way mental grammar comes to be organised and structured (Langacker 2000), and the way language is acquired (Tomasello 2003). In terms of the former, Bybee 2006 provides evidence for the role of frequency, while Bybee and Hopper 2001 is an important collection of papers in this regard. Bybee 2010 presents a synthesis of the state of the art. Barlow and Kemmer 2000 is an

influential collection relating to more general issues concerning mental grammar and usage. In terms of language acquisition, Langacker 2009 provides a recent theoretical treatment, while Lieven et al. 2003 provides a classic case study in favour of a usage-based approach to first language acquisition. Dąbrowska 2005 presents an influential review of the cognitive and neurological constraints on usage-based perspectives of grammar.

Barlow, M. & S. Kemmer. 2000. *Usage-based models of language*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
> An influential collection of papers by leading proponents of usage-based approaches to language learning.

Bybee, J. 2006. From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language* 8, 711–733.
> Provides evidence for the role of frequency in the development of mental grammar.

Bybee, J. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
> Examines the dynamic usage-based processes that give rise to mental representation of language.

Bybee, J. & P. Hopper. 2001. *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> An influential collected volume concerning the role of frequency on grammatical organisation and structure.

Dąbrowska, E. 2005. *Language, mind and brain: Some psychological and neurological constraints on theories of Grammar*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
> Examines psychological and cognitive issues relating to the acquisition and structure of linguistic representation, adopting a broadly usage-based perspective.

Langacker, R. 2000 A dynamic usage-based model. In M. Barlow & S. Kemmer (eds.), *Usage-based models of language*, 1-63. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
> Langacker provides a detailed overview of the Cognitive Grammar usage-based model of language.

Langacker, R. 2009. A dynamic view of usage and language acquisition. *Cognitive Linguistics,* 20–3: 627–640
> An important theoretical exposition of a usage-based approach to language acquisition from a Cognitive Grammar perspective.

Lieven, E., H. Behrens, J. Speares & M. Tomasello. 2003. Early syntactic creativity: A usage-based approach. *Journal of Child Language*, 30: 333–370.

    A seminal study demonstrating the role creativity in language acquisition.

Tomasello, M. 2003. *Constructing a Language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

    The definitive account of the role of language-use and general cognitive abilities in the acquisition of language.