

语言学系列讲座

（认知、功能）

Seven Lectures (13 titles) on Cognitive and Functional Linguistics
by Professor Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza and Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón

我们荣幸地邀请到了世界著名认知语言学专家Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza教授和功能语言学专家Ricardo Mairal Usón教授来京讲学，欢迎大家前来听讲。听讲免费。

主讲人：Professor Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza（西班牙La Rioja大学）

研究方向：认知语言学（尤其转喻）、语用学

Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón（西班牙Distance National大学）

研究方向：功能、词汇、句法

主要内容：Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza和Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón教授将利用7讲13个题目系统讲授他们最新的合作研究成果词汇构造模式（LCM）。LCM阐释理解词汇意义和句法意义之间的关系。从功能投射理论和构式语法理论对语言进行描述和解释。

讲座分别在北京大学、清华大学、北京师范大学、北京外国语大学、北京航空航天大学、北京对外经济贸易大学和北京邮电大学举行。并由各学校负责安排和接待。

为了方便外地听众，我们可以协助在北大校内招待所订房间。北大资源宾馆标准间每日房价为380元（010-62757199）、校内招待所标准间162元、120元、100元（010-62753583）校内招待所50元（010-62753954、62767990）。外地听讲人员的交通、食宿事宜及费用自理。需住宿者请务必提前联系。届时您可自行前往。若需帮助请早联系（010-62764115 / cxl617@126.com），联系人：陈香兰。

陈香兰

北京大学外文学院博士后流动站

2007年4月10日

每讲题目、地点、时间

(每讲有两个题目，分别由两人讲)

第1讲：主讲人：Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón

题目：**Challenging systems of lexical representation: frames vs. lexical templates**

主讲人：Professor Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza

题目：**Why do functional theories need a cognitive component? The role of metaphor and metonymy in linguistic explanation**

时间：5月14日，周一，下午2：40-4：30

地点：北京大学(西门)，化北楼 122

第2讲：主讲人：Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón

题目：**The Lexical Constructional Model: The General Architecture**

时间：5月15日，周二，下午3：00-5：00

地点：北京师范大学（东门），教4

(Professor Ruiz de Mendoza has another meeting on that day.)

第3讲：主讲人：Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón

题目：**Internal constraints within a functional cognitive theory of meaning**

主讲人：Professor Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza

题目：**The scope of external constraints within a functional cognitive theory of meaning**

时间：5月16日，周三，下午3：30-5：30

地点：清华大学（南门），四教4304

第4讲：主讲人：Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón

题目：**How to build a lexical template**

主讲人：Professor Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza

题目：**Constructional templates and lexical-constructional subsumption**

时间：5月17日，周四，下午1：20-3：10

地点：北京对外经济贸易大学，诚信楼14层

第5讲: 主讲人: Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón

题 目: **First steps towards the computational implementation of the Lexical Constructional Model**

主讲人: Professor Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza

题 目: **High-level metaphor and metonymy: pedagogical implications**

时间: 5月17日, 周四, 下午4: 00-6: 00

地点: 北京外国语大学(东校区), 逸夫楼

第6讲: 主讲人: Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón

题 目: **The anatomy of the construction**

主讲人: Professor Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza

题 目: **Constructions and templates: the resultative construction.**

时间: 5月18日, 周五, 上午9: 30-11: 30

地点: 北京航空航天大学(东南门) 如心楼806

第7讲: 主讲人: Professor Ricardo Mairal Usón

题 目: **Towards a universal semantic metalanguage for lexical representation**

主讲人: Professor Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza

题 目: **The pragmatic grounding of the Lexical Constructional Model**

时间: 5月18日, 周五, 下午3: 30-5: 30

地点: 北京邮电大学(西门或南门), 教三

SUMMARIES

JOINT LECTURES

Prof. Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza and Ricardo Mairal Usón

LECTURE 1

Peking University

- Challenging systems of lexical representation: frames vs. lexical templates

Summary:

In the last few years the lexicon has come to occupy a prominent place in linguistic theory, including both formal and functional paradigms. This talk then examines the most relevant approaches to lexical representation and discusses the fundamentals of ‘role-centered approaches’ and ‘predicate-centered approaches’. With this theoretical background in mind, we move on to explain some more recent proposals which contain an enhanced semantic component, a theoretical move which is in consonance with the premises of a functional cognitive theory of language. In connection with this, we focus on the notion of lexical templates as firstly envisaged within Role and Reference Grammar.

- Why do functional theories need a cognitive component? The role of metaphor and metonymy in language explanation

Summary:

We believe that functional and cognitive models are characterized by an important degree of complementariness which goes well beyond their shared concern with language use and the cognitive dimension of grammatical categories to more central issues such as the relationship between lexicon and grammar. Within this context, this talk outlines our own views on how constructional and process models may be fruitfully combined. As a first approximation, we discuss the following three major issues (i) the role of constructions, (ii) the nature of primitives, and (iii) the non-propositional status of some representations. Hence, we maintain that functional approaches should include conceptual cognitive mechanisms, e.g. high-level metaphor and high-level metonymy, as part of their explanatory adequacy.

LECTURE 2

Beijing Normal University

- The Lexical Constructional Model: The General Architecture.

Summary

The Lexical Constructional Model (LCM) arises from the concern to account for the relationship between syntax and all facets on meaning construction, including traditional implicature and illocutionary meaning. The new framework draws insights from functional models of language (especially, Van Valin's Role and Reference Grammar or RRG; Van Valin, 2005) and Cognitive Linguistics (especially, Lakoff's cognitive model theory; Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; and Goldberg's constructional approach; Goldberg, 1995, 2005) in order to investigate the way lexical and constructional representations interact. At the heart of the LCM we find the notions of *lexical* and *constructional templates*, which are the building blocks of the model. The principled interaction between lexical and constructional templates supplies the central or *core* meaning layer for other more *peripheral* operations -involving implicated meaning- to take place. Then, this talk deals with the most relevant components that define the whole architecture of the model and also presents the potential applications (pedagogical, computational, lexicographic, typological, psycholinguistic etc.) which are being currently undertaken.

LECTURE 3

Tsinghua University

- **Internal constraints within a functional cognitive theory of meaning.**

Within the context of the Lexical Constructional Model (LCM), these two talks are concerned with *lexical-constructional subsumption*, a key meaning production mechanism that is governed by two kinds of *constraints on coercion*: *internal* and *external*. Internal constraints arise from the semantic properties of the lexical and constructional templates and do not affect the *Aktionsart* ascription of the predicates involved. Internal constraints specify the conditions under which a lexical template may modify its internal configuration: the *variable suppression constraint* regulates the possibility of suppressing a template variable, as is the case with the *Instrument Subject* construction, which omits the actor (e.g. *A bat broke the window* versus *A bat broke the window by the boy*); the *predicate integration condition* accounts for the impossibility for ‘hit’ verbs of participating in the *Middle* construction (cf. *This knife cuts well* vs. **This hammer hits well*), since the constructional template may introduce a new predicate (here an evaluative element) into the lexical template only if the semantics of the added element is compatible with the configuration of the lexical predicate. ‘Break’ verbs code a resultant state that can be evaluated, while ‘hit’ verbs do not code such an element. Internal constraints also specify the conditions that allow a predicate to take part in a certain constructional alternation. For example, the *lexical class constraint* explains why ‘break’ verbs may take part in the causative/inchoative alternation (cf. *The child broke the window* and *The window broke*), while ‘destroy’ verbs may not. The reason is that ‘destroy’ verbs belong to the lexical class of ‘existence’ verbs, while ‘break’ verbs are verbs of ‘change of state’.

- **The scope of external constraints within a functional cognitive theory of meaning**

External constraints do involve *Aktionsart* changes and result from the possibility or impossibility of performing high-level metaphoric and metonymic operations on the lexical items involved in the subsumption process. As an example of external constraint, consider the conversion of ‘laugh (at)’, an activity predicate, into a causative accomplishment predicate when taking part in the *Caused-Motion* construction: *They laughed him out of the room*. This reinterpretation process hinges upon the correlation between two kinds of actor and two kinds of object. In the case of causative accomplishments, the actor and object are an *effector* and an *effectee*, i.e. an actor whose action has a direct impact and subsequent effects on the object. With activities, the actor is a mere “doer” of the action that is experienced by the object. This observation suggests an analysis of the subcategorical conversion process experienced by “laugh” in terms of *source* and *target* domain correspondences (EXPERIENTIAL ACTION IS EFFECTUAL ACTION), of the kind proposed in Cognitive Linguistics (cf. Lakoff, 1993). We will explore other high-level metaphors and metonymies that have a grammatical impact, among

them COMMUNICATIVE ACTION IS EFFECTUAL ACTION (e.g. *He talked me into it*), A NON-EFFECTUAL ACTIVITY IS AN EFFECTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENT (e.g. *He drank himself into a stupor*), PROCESS FOR ACTION (e.g. *The door opened*) and PROCESS FOR ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT (e.g. *This washing powder washes whiter*).

LECTURE 4

University of International Business and Economics

- How to build a lexical template.

Summary:

This aim of this talk is to provide a step-by-step guide to the format of a lexical template. A lexical template consists of a *semantic specification* plus a *logical structure*. The logical structure formalism is constructed on the basis of *Aktionsart* distinctions proposed in *Role and Reference Grammar* (Van Valin, 2005). *Aktionsart* regularities are captured by the external variables of the template, specified in Roman characters) and by a set of high-level elements of structure that function as semantic primitives. Lexical templates also contain internal variables marked with Arabic numerals and coded in terms of lexical functions as propounded in Mel'cuk's *Explanatory and Combinatorial Lexicology* (cf. Mel'cuk, 1989; Mel'cuk and Wanner, 1996). These variables capture world-knowledge elements that relate in a way specific to the predicate defined by the lexical template. Consider the entry for a cognition predicate like *grasp*:

Grasp: [MagnObstr & Culm₁₂[_{ALL}]] **know'** (x, y)

The entry for *grasp* has two parts: (i) the semantic component in brackets; (ii) the representation of the logical structure. In this case, this predicate is represented by a state logical structure which takes **know'** as a primitive and has two arguments (x, y). This logical structure is in turn modified by a lexical function (or operator) MagnObstr, which specifies the large degree of difficulty involved in carrying out the action. The other lexical function, Culm, captures the end-point of knowing something (which is understanding). Note that *grasp* is a hyponym of understand and consequently inherits all the semantic properties of the superordinate. ALL is another lexical function -of the kind postulated by Mel'cuk- that falls within the scope of the internal variables.

- Constructional templates and lexical-constructional subsmption.

Constructional templates make use of the same metalanguage as lexical templates, as evidenced by our proposed format of the caused-motion construction:

do' (x, [**pred'** (x, y)] CAUSE [BECOME NOT **be-in'** (y,z)]
pred' (x, y) CAUSE [BECOME NOT **be-in'** (y,z)]

Note that what is characteristic of this construction is that there is an induced phenomenon which causes a change of location. The second part is a recurrent pattern (e.g. BECOME NOT **be-in'** (y, z)) in every representation of the constructional template, while the first part varies between an

activity and a state template. Since the formal apparatus of lexical templates shares with higher-level constructions all elements excepting those that are specific to a lower-level class, absorption of a lexical template by a construction becomes a straightforward, redundancy-free process (see Figure 2 below for a simplified representation of lexical-constructional subsumption in *She loved me back into life*). This kind of formulation captures relevant features that lexical template representations share with constructional representations, which makes our description fully at home with the idea of a lexical-constructional continuum.

LECTURE 5

Beijing Foreign Studies University

- First steps towards the computational implementation of the Lexical Constructional Model.

Summary:

This talk deals with the computational implementation of the Lexical Constructional Model and is specifically concerned with the format of a machine translation engine. One of the advantages of this proposal over others is that instead of constructing an interlingua, as has been common practice in many machine translation applications, we argue that each language should be described using a language-specific metalanguage which will eventually be mapped into the target metalanguage. So, the idea is that both the source and the target language are represented by means of a metalanguage and the process of translation will then consist of mapping the two representations. A further issue is to define the ingredients of the metalanguage. In this regard, we claim that the metalanguage should consist of a number of primes and a set of intervals (a mathematical notion), which will allow us to combine each of the primes to produce other non-atomic predicates. Furthermore, the new formalism is computationally interpreted in terms of two ontologies: the predicate and the object ontology. We discuss each of the modules and the way the two work together.

- High-level metaphor and metonymy: pedagogical implications.

Summary

In the context of the goal to create explanatorily adequate pedagogical grammars based on explicit teaching, this presentation argues that Cognitive Linguistics offers both theoretical and applied linguists powerful analytical tools that allow them to capture systematically language-internal and language-external similarities and differences. In order to substantiate this assertion, we discuss the similarities and differences in some areas of grammar where English and Spanish differ and discuss some specific implications for language teaching of theoretically-driven contrastive analysis in systematically identifying areas of difficulty in terms of different conceptualization strategies. We additionally argue that learning about the cognitive motivation of linguistic phenomena may enhance a student's understanding of many crucial aspects of the target system, which may result in an improved mastery of the target language.

LECTURE 6

Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics

- **The anatomy of the construction.**

Summary

One of the central components in the Lexical Constructional Model is the construction, a component which describes the catalogue of constructions in a language; for example, the transitive, ditransitive, resultative, caused-motion, intransitive, conative constructions etc.. Then, the description of a construction specifies the semantic, pragmatic and morphosyntactic features that are unique to a particular construction. In line with Goldberg (1995, 2005), constructions are arranged prototypically in that there is a central sense and a cluster of closely related uses that can also be regarded as instances of a construction. Within this context, we discuss examples of the instrument, causative /inchoative and the transitive subjective construction in English and Spanish. Finally, we show how from this analysis we can compile a dictionary of constructions, an extremely challenging issue in lexicography today. .

- **Metonymy and anaphora.**

Summary

Based on previous work by Ruiz de Mendoza & Díez (2004), this presentation deals with some problematic cases of anaphoric reference to a metonymic noun. Our analysis shows that anaphoric reference to simple metonymies (i.e. those in which there is only one matrix domain involved) is governed by the *Domain Availability Principle* (only the matrix domain of a metonymy is available for anaphoric reference) and the *Constraint on Metonymic Anaphora* (the anaphoric pronoun cannot have an independent metonymic interpretation),. Contrary to what has been postulated by other linguists, we argue that the animate/ inanimate nature of the domains of a metonymy is not relevant to account for the various anaphoric uses. Besides, in order to explain anaphoric reference in cases of double metonymic mappings (i.e. those in which there are two matrix domains) we have put forward two additional principles, the *Domain Precedence Principle* and the *Domain Combinability Principle*. Our view offers a consistent explanation of some cases of metonymic anaphora that have been regarded as problematic by other authors. Finally, we make a distinction between reference to a metonymic noun and implicative reference with the purpose of adequately accounting for examples which appear to involve metonymy but which, as a matter of fact, do not.

LECTURE 7

Beijing University of Posts and Telecoms

- **Towards a universal semantic metalanguage.**

Summary

One of the most attractive aims in lexical representation theory is to provide typologically valid lexical structures. In this regard, this talk explores the following approaches to universal lexical representation: (i) those based on aktionsart distinctions; (ii) those that develop an inventory of universal primes using natural language. We believe that if we want to work with lexical representations that include a rich semantic and pragmatic description, then a combination of the two approaches can be extremely useful. We show how this has been achieved within the context of the Lexical Constructional Model by providing examples from verbs that belong to the domain of cognition, speech act and emotion.

- **The pragmatic grounding of the Lexical Constructional Model.**

Summary

The Lexical Constructional Model maintains that constructional templates should include aspects of the theory which fall within the territory of pragmatic implicature, illocutionary force or discourse structure. Hence, the following levels of description are included as part of the analysis of the LCM:

Level 2: constructions accounting for heavily conventionalized situation-based low-level implications.

Level 3: constructions that account for conventionalized illocutionary meaning (situation-based high-level implications).

Level 4: constructions based on very schematic discourse structures.

This proposal lays out the theoretical basis for the pragmatic and discourse foundation of the LCM.

该讲座结束后将汇编成册出版，望有兴趣的朋友关注并保持联系。

陈香兰
北京大学外国语学院博士后流动站
2007年4月20日