



COURSE UNIT (MODULE) DESCRIPTION

Course unit (module) title	Code
Cognitive Linguistics/Kognityvinė lingvistika	

Lecturer(s)	Department(s) where the course unit (module) is delivered
Coordinator: Prof. Dr Inesa Šeškauskienė Other(s): ----	Centre for Multilingual Studies, Institute of Applied Linguistics

Study cycle	Type of the course unit (module)
2 nd	Compulsory for the English Studies Programme (track of English Linguistics), optional for other programmes

Mode of delivery	Period when the course unit (module) is delivered	Language(s) of instruction
Contact (lectures, workshops) and individual work	Spring semester	English

Requirements for students	
Prerequisites: English language skills (not lower than B2 according to CEFR)	Co-requisites (if any): Basic knowledge and skills in linguistics (introduction to linguistics and any other linguistic course (e.g. introduction to semantics, introduction to pragmatics, etc.))

Course (module) volume in credits	Total student's workload	Contact hours	Self-study hours
5	135	35	100

Purpose of the course unit (module): programme competences to be developed
<p>The purpose of the course is to further develop an understanding of linguistics and its different trends by specifically focusing on a nowadays influential school of cognitive linguistics. In order to attain the purpose, the following competences will be developed.</p> <p>Generic competences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Working autonomously, designing strategies and managing time: ability to decide on objectives, priorities, methods, time and resources available to perform a task. 2) Analytical and critical thinking: ability to think in detail, to find quantitative and qualitative interrelations between constituents, to pose questions inviting discussion. 3) Quality orientation: excellence in academic, personal and professional results with emphasis on continuous improvement. <p>Subject-specific competences</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Linguistics skills: knowledge and understanding of surface structures and underlying semantic implications as well as their cognitive nature; 2) Ability to use knowledge of linguistic research methods from a contemporary perspective, make judgements with incomplete or limited information.

3) Application of knowledge in practice: establishing direct connections between them, solving problems in new environments.

Learning outcomes of the course unit (module)	Teaching and learning methods	Assessment methods
Learning outcomes resulting from the generic competences: practical skills of obtaining information necessary to accomplish linguistic tasks using a variety of sources; ability to discern different types of relations between the components; ability to ask appropriate “Why” questions and invite discussion; capability to organize his/her work autonomously; ability to advance systematically in academic work and evaluate personal achievements properly.	Lectures, workshops, in-class discussion, individual tasks, peer review	Generic competences: Attendance and class participation based on in-class discussion; individual tasks
Learning outcomes resulting from the subject-specific competences: in-depth knowledge of the main principles of cognitive linguistics as distinct from other (more traditional) linguistic trends; in-depth knowledge of cognitive linguistic concepts and methodologies; ability to identify linguistic problems and suggest solutions; ability to communicate the ideas from the field of study to the audience orally and in writing when working on specific tasks.	Lectures, workshops, in-class discussion, individual tasks, peer review	Subject-specific competences: Individual tasks, mid-term test, final examination

Content: breakdown of the topics	Contact hours							Self-study work: time and assignments	
	Lectures	Tutorials	Seminars	Exercises	Laboratory work	Internship/work	Contact hours	Self-study hours	Assignments
1. General arrangements: requirements, texts etc. Introduction to the main principles of CL. Philosophical framework: objectivist vs. subjectivist approach. Experientialism. Language and thought. Semiotic principles of language	2		2				4	6	Tasksheet prepared by the lecturer. Readings: Croft and Cruse: 1-4; Dirven and Verspoor: 1-13. Evans, Bergen & Zinken: 1-13; 36-47. Lakoff 119-122 (154) (optional).
2. Categorization. Traditional and cognitive approach to categorization. Category structure and levels of categorisation. Vertical dimension and horizontal dimension. Prototype theory. Prototype effects in language. The role of gestalt. Family resemblance principle. Meaning and context, situation, gestalt, culture (cultural models). Encyclopaedic knowledge. Frame semantics. Folk and expert categories.	4		3				7	12	Tasksheet prepared by the lecturer. Reading: Rosch 27-48; Ungerer & Schmid 7-58; Evans and Green 251-269. Taylor 59-80; Dirven 14-16 (optional); Fillmore 111-137; Croft & Cruse 40-73. Assignment 1 due.

3. Cognitive semantics: embodiment, conceptualization and construal. Polysemy and monosemy in traditional and cognitive approach. Radial category. Vagueness and ambiguity.	2		2				4	8	Tasksheet prepared by the lecturer. Reading: Evans, Bergen and Zinken 6-15; Dirven 16-18 (optional). Ungerer and Schmid 1-42; Evans and Green 251-269; Taylor 59-80; 99-121
4 Mid-term test		1	1				2	14	Revision. Preparation.
5 Feedback on mid-term. Analysis of individual cases		1	1				2		
6. Traditional and cognitive approach to metaphor and metonymy. CL metonymy: transfer in a single domain. Referring expressions. CL metaphor: conceptual metaphor. Source and target domain, mapping, metaphorical expressions, hiding and highlighting, invariance hypothesis. Universal and culture-specific metaphoricity. Cross-cultural features of metaphors. Metaphonymy. Multimodal metaphor. Mental space theory.	2		2				4	12	Tasksheet prepared by the lecturer. Reading: Kövecses 3-12, 15-25; Lakoff and Johnson 10-13, 56-60; Evans & Green 286-320. Taylor, 130-141; Forceville 214-260. Urbonaitė & Šeškauskienė (optional) Šeškauskienė & Valentjeva (optional). Sweetser and Fauconnier Croft and Cruse 32-39 Evans and Green 382 -386 Assignment 2 due.
7. Space conceptualization. Figure and Ground, types of F and G. Geometry. Distribution of attention. Fictive motion. Metaphor and spatial relations. Culture-specific space conceptualization.	2		2				4	12	Tasksheet prepared by the lecturer. Reading: Ungerer and Schmid 2006: 163–168; 172–174; Majid et al. 108-114. Talmy 177–245 (optional, but highly recommended); Šeškauskienė and Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė (optional). Assignment 3 due
8 Sapir-Whorf's hypothesis and linguistic relativity. Space. Frames of reference. Time. Shapes and substances (countability), gender across languages. Case studies. Writing systems.	1		1				2	10	Tasksheet prepared by the lecturer. Reading: Boroditsky, 917–921; Boroditsky et al. 61-79; Chan and Bergen; Majid et al. 108-114.
9 Cognitive grammar. Constructionist approach to language. Construction grammar	1		1				2	8	Reading: Goldberg Evans and Green 475-478, 484, 500-507, 533-544, 692-708 Bergen, Chang and Narayan Langacker (optional)
10 Revision, follow up, evaluation of the course			1				1		Preparation for the final test
11 Final test. Feedback on the final test		1	2				3	18	
Total	14	3	18				35	100	

Assessment strategy: cumulative assessment	Weight, %	Deadline	Assessment criteria
Attendance and participation	5	Throughout the course	Relevant participation in class discussion; no more than 1 class missed; completion of small (exercise type) individual tasks

Assignment 1 Assignment 2 Assignment 3	12 14 13	Week 4 or 5 Week 10 or 11 Week 13 or 14	Criteria: 1) relevant content (explicit reference to readings, demonstration of clear understanding of the topic, relevant examples, etc.), 2) coherent structure and consistency of argumentation, 3) language accuracy and academic conventions. The distribution of points is indicated in the task.
Mid-term test	25	Week 8 or 9	The test consists of several (4-5) questions, which are based on the materials covered. A response to each question is evaluated considering relevant content and explicit reference to readings; consistent application of the theory in the analysis of the examples; language accuracy. The distribution of points is indicated in the task.
Final examination	30	End of module	The test consists of several (5-7) questions, which are based on the materials covered. A response to each question is evaluated considering relevant content and explicit reference to readings, consistent application of the theory in the analysis of the examples; language accuracy. The distribution of points is indicated in the task. General criteria: 10 (excellent). Excellent knowledge and abilities. 95-100% of questions answered correctly. 9 (very good). Very good knowledge and abilities. 85-94 % of questions answered correctly. 8 (good). Knowledge and abilities are above average. 75-84 % of questions answered correctly. 7 (average). Average knowledge and abilities; there are a few not essential mistakes. 65-74 % of questions answered correctly. 6 (satisfactory). Knowledge and abilities are below average; there are mistakes. 55-64 % of questions answered correctly. 5 (weak). Knowledge and abilities meet the minimum requirements. 51-54 % of questions answered correctly. 4, 3, 2, 1. Minimum requirements are not met.

Author	Year of publication	Title	Issue of a periodical or volume of a publication	Publishing place and house or web link
Compulsory reading				
Bergen, B., N. Chang and Sh. Narayan	2004	Simulated Action in an Embodied Construction Grammar	<i>Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society</i>	Available from: http://www2.hawaii.edu/~7Ebergen/papers/BCN04.pdf ,
Boroditsky, L.	2001	Linguistic relativity	<i>Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science</i>	MacMillan
Boroditsky, L., L. Schmidt and W. Philips	2003	Sex, Syntax and Semantics	D. Gentner & S. Goldin-Meadow (eds). <i>Language in Mind: Advances in the Study of Language and Cognition</i> . Pp. 61-79	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Chan, T.T. and B. Bergen	2005	Writing direction influences spatial cognition	<i>Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society</i> .	
Croft, W. & A. Cruse	2004		<i>Cognitive Linguistics</i>	Cambridge: CUP

Diessel, H.	2004	A dynamic network model of grammatical constructions	Diessel, H. <i>The Acquisition of Complex Sentences</i> . Pp. 13-40.	Cambridge: CUP
Dirven, R. and M. Verspoor (eds)	1998/2004		<i>Cognitive Exploration of Language and Linguistics</i>	1 st or 2 nd ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Evans, V., B. K. Bergen and J. Zinken.	2007	<i>The Cognitive Linguistic Enterprise: an overview. The Cognitive Linguistics Reader</i>		London: Equinox
Evans, V. and M. Green	2006		<i>Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction</i>	Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Fillmore, Ch.	1982	Frame semantics	The Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.) <i>Linguistics in the Morning Calm</i> . Pp. 111-137.	Seoul: Hanshin.
Forceville, Ch.	2016	Pictorial and multimodal metaphor	N.-M. Klug & H. Stockl (eds). <i>Handbuch Sprache im multimodalen Kontext [The Language in Multimodal Contexts Handbook]</i> . Linguistic Knowledge Series.	Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 241-260.
Goldberg, A.	2003	Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language	<i>Trends in Cognitive Science</i> 7-5: 219-224.	
Kövecses, Z.	2002		<i>Metaphor. A Practical Introduction</i> .	Oxford: OUP
Majid, A., M. Bowerman, S. Kita, D. Haun and S. Levinson	2004	Can language restructure cognition? The case for space	<i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i> 8 (3): 108-114	
Rosch, E.	1978	Principles of categorization	E. Rosch and B. B. Loyd (eds.) <i>Cognition and Categorization</i> . Pp. 27-48.	Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Sweetser, E. and G. Fauconnier	1996	Cognitive links and domains: basic aspects of mental space theory	Fauconnier, G. & E. Sweetser (eds). <i>Spaces, Worlds, and Grammar</i> . Pp. 1-28.	Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press
Taylor, J. R.	1995 or 2003		<i>Linguistic Categorization. Prototypes in Linguistic Theory</i>	Oxford: OUP
Ungerer, F. and H. J. Schmid	1996/2006		<i>An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics</i>	1 st or 2 nd ed. Longman
Optional reading				
Boroditsky, L. and M. Ramscar	2002	The Roles of Body and Mind in Abstract Thought	<i>Psychological Science</i> 13 (2): 185-189	
Feist, M. & S. Duffy	2020	On the path of time temporal motion in typological perspective	<i>Language and Cognition</i> 12: 444-467.	
Fillmore, Ch. J. and B. T. Atkins	1992	Towards a frame-based organization of the lexicon: the semantics of RISK and its neighbors	A. Lehrer and E. Kittay (eds) <i>Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantics and Lexical Organization</i> . Pp. 75-102.	Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum
Lakoff, G.	1988	Cognitive semantics	U. Eco, M. Santambrogio & P. Violi (eds) <i>Meaning and Mental Representations</i> . Pp. 119-154.	Bloomington.
Langacker, R. W.	1987		<i>Foundations of Cognitive Grammar</i> . V. I.	Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Šeškauskienė, I. and O. Valentjeva	2015	Poetic journeys and other metaphors underlying literary criticism of poetry in English and Russian.	<i>Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada. Special Issue on Metaphor and Metonymy as Social Practices.</i> Luciane Ferreira and Ray Gibbs (eds.).15 (2): 421–452.	Belo Horizonte: Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbla/v15n2/1984-6398-rbla-15-02-00421.pdf
Šeškauskienė, I. and E.Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė	2015	On the polysemy of the Lithuanian Už: a cognitive perspective	<i>The Baltic International Yearbook of Cognition, Logic and Communication</i> 10: 1-38.	Kansas: New Prairie Press. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1101&context=biyclc
Talmy, L.	2000	How language structures space	L. Talmy. <i>Towards Cognitive Semantics</i> . Pp. 177-245.	The MIT Press. http://wings.buffalo.edu/linguistics/people/faculty/talmy/talmyweb/Volume1/chap3.pdf
Urbonaitė, J. and I. Šeškauskienė	2007	Health metaphor in political and economic discourse: a cross linguistic analysis.	<i>Kalbų studijos/Studies about Languages</i> 11: 68-73.	http://www.kalbos.lt/zurnalai/11_numeris/09.pdf

Last updated: November 20, 2023