Anna Dąbrowska, Maria Curie-Sklodowska University, Poland

Introduction:
Within Semantic-Conceptual Structure and Beyond

1. Lexicon and grammar continuum

Modern linguistics has long been believed to have grown out of Ferdinand de Saussure's concept of the *linguistic sign*, which consists of an idea or meaning (the signified) and its expression or form (the signifier) (Saussure, 1968, 1971, 1915/1981, p. 99). The nature of language seems to resemble, but never be identical to, the Saussurean form-meaning pair in that semantics occupies one pole of the unit, while the other is taken by its phonological and/or morphological shape. Nonetheless, the existing division between syntax and semantics is not so sharp (Langacker, 1976, p. 315). For Ronald W. Langacker (2010, p. 1), commonly considered one of the pioneers of the Cognitive Linguistics movement and the father of Cognitive Grammar, "[l]anguage necessarily comprises semantic structures, phonological structures, and symbolic links between the two." Being symbolic in nature, language "makes available to the speaker – for either personal or communicative use – an open-ended set of linguistic *signs* or *expressions*, each of which associates a semantic representation of some kind with a phonological representation" (Langacker, 1987, p. 11; cf. Taylor, 2002, p. 39). In other words, in a given linguistic item, called 'unit' within Cognitive Grammar, the so-called semantic pole "reflects meaning in a number of ways and for all kinds of units, and not solely defined as the external referent of single words" (Winters, 2015, p. 152).

Yet, regardless of the dual nature of linguistic units, both the precursors and followers of Cognitive Linguistics, and of Cognitive Grammar in particular, maintain that "lexicon and grammar form a continuum, and that only symbolic structures – each residing in the symbolic linkage of a semantic and a phonological structure – figure in their proper characterization" (Langacker, 2010, p. 1). Henceforth, lexicon, morphology, and syntax form a gradation consisting of assemblies

Anna Dąbrowska, Katedra Lingwistyki Stosowanej, Instytut Językoznawstwa i Literaturoznawstwa, Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, ul. Sowińskiego 17, 20-040 Lublin, anna.dabrowska@mail.umcs.pl, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7170-4070

of symbolic structures (form-meaning pairings). In fact, in all cognitivist models of language, as elucidated by Henryk Kardela (2020, p. 21), linguistic units seem to form a continuum within semantic-conceptual structure.

Based on these central assumptions and tenets which constitute the fundamentals of the Cognitive Linguistics framework, this volume brings together nine chapters which present an elaboration of theoretical issues as well as empirical case studies that rely on various kinds of experimental data and corpus data or a combination of both. The chapters are perspicuously linked to the main characteristic feature of Cognitive Linguistics, namely, "investigating the relationship between human language, the mind and socio-physical experience" (Evans, Bergen, & Zinken, 2007, p. 1). This common element is what motivates the title of the volume, i.e., *Language, Cognition and Socio-physical Experience*. The nine chapters of this volume refer to the two basic areas of research carried out within the Cognitive Linguistics perspective, i.e., (i) Cognitive (approaches to) Grammar, and (ii) Cognitive Semantics – most of which are usage-based approaches. In the subsequent sections of this chapter, all the contributions are briefly introduced. The division of the volume into the Cognitive Grammar research (section 2) and Cognitive Semantics studies (section 3) is rather conventional because it is difficult to draw a clear boundary as to the field in which a given author conducts his/her research. There are undoubtedly some issues that overlap and may also occur in other areas of research.

2. A Cognitive Grammar perspective

In the cognitivist view of grammar, contrary to the generativist approach, grammar is meaningful, which results from the fact that the elements of grammar, such as single vocabulary items or complex expressions (like phrases, clauses, and sentences), have their own meaning. In addition, grammar enables us to construct and symbolise more elaborate meanings of linguistic units. Hence, far from being a separate and self-contained cognitive system, grammar functions as an integral part of cognition and a key to understanding it (Kardela, 2020, p. 21; Langacker, 2008, pp. 3–4).

Being subject to refinement and elaboration over four decades, Cognitive Grammar has not changed in any fundamental way, dealing with the structure, and meaning in grammar. In its general outline, the Cognitive Grammar framework is realised within two different approaches (lines) to language study. The first one, pursued by such scholars as Ronald W. Langacker (1987, 1991), focuses on the study of the cognitive principles which give rise to linguistic structure. These researchers try to delineate the principles that organise grammar and relate them to the aspects of general cognition. The second line of investigation, represented by Paul Kay and Charles Fillmore (1999), George Lakoff (1987), Adele Goldberg (1995) and Benjamin Bergen and Nancy Chang (2005), among others, tend to provide a more descriptive account of the linguistic units (from morphemes to words, idioms, and phrasal patterns) within a particular language.

The first chapter of this volume, written Langacker, contributes to the latest developments in the field of Cognitive Grammar. His study builds from fundamentals and the background required for comprehension. The main concern of the researcher is to investigate conceptual and linguistic structure in terms of their relation to one another. The two aspects to be examined include a general feature of cognition (B/E organization, cf. Langacker, 2016), and a cognitive model representing our conception of reality, both of which form a persuasive explanation of central features of English clause structure. As assumed by the scientist, linguistic structure tends to be systematised in successive levels (or strata), each being elaborated (E) on the ground of a baseline (B). The higher level a clause unfolds at, the more incorporated additional resources, the richer reality conception, and the wider array of structural options. Reality conception contains the established course of events, which a given conceptualizer accepts as real. Based on these essentials, Langacker (this volume) proposes implementing the reality model into English clause structure. The clause structure is not only built on different levels, but it can gradually reveal the fundamental cognitive aspects of prelinguistic experience (cf. Langacker, 2013, p. 15). Henceforth, clause structures involve different conceptual layers, the so-called levels of reality. Interestingly, even though the researcher's reference to one-clause expressions in English does not allow him to make a universal claim, his innovative account does prove some schematic organisations which reveal the abstract character of clausal grounding. This observation makes Langacker state that "linguistic structure is revealingly characterised in terms of a notion of reality, comprising multiple dimensions and levels of organization" (Langacker, this volume).

In their chapter, Henryk Kardela, Anna Kędra-Kardela and Andrzej Sławomir Kowalczyk, driven from Langacker's (1991) conception of grouping, adjust Roman Ingarden's theory of the literary work of art to the Cognitive Grammar paradigm. By means of the gestalt-based mechanism of grouping, combined with Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner's (2002) conceptual integration theory, the multi-strata nature of the literary work (as proposed by Ingarden (1973, 2000)), is meant to be holistically analysed within Cognitive Poetics, developed by Peter Stockwell (2020). The elaborations on the 'places of indeterminacy' in Adam Mickiewicz's sonnet entitled "The Ackerman Steppe" are genuinely performed by Kardela et al. Their results reveal that; indeed, the cognitive process of grouping is a promising methodological tool that seems to transcend, in a gestalt-like manner, all 'levels' of conceptual organization. The researchers are convinced that within the Cognitive Grammar framework, a cognitive-poetic study of literary texts can be plausibly and effectively applied, by taking advantage of the valuable 'old' literary theories like Ingarden's and placing them into the modern literary discourse (Kardela et al., this volume).

3. A Cognitive Semantics perspective

The area of study known as Cognitive Semantics deals with investigating the relationship between experience, the conceptual system, and the semantic structure encoded by language. To be precise, scholars working in this cognitive area account for knowledge representation (conceptual structure) and meaning construction (conceptualization). Language for cognitive semanticists is recognized as the lens through which these cognitive phenomena can be scrutinised. While Cognitive Grammar is concerned with modelling the language system (the mental 'grammar'), Cognitive Semantics focuses on modelling and examining the nature of the human mind. It is human conceptualization thanks to which linguistic meaning is revealed. Accordingly, the thesis that 'meaning is conceptualization', is what specifies Cognitive Semantics most (Evans, 2012; Geeraerts, 2006).

The first valuable contribution which belongs to the scope of Cognitive Semantics is the one made by Zoltán Kövecses, who investigates the interrelations among the notions of metaphor, discourse, and creativity. Defining conceptual metaphor as a set of mappings between the source and the target domains, the researcher clarifies that metaphorical creativity from a discourse perspective can involve source-induced creativity, target-induced creativity, and context-induced creativity. Taking context into consideration, Kövecses claims that conceptualizers (both hearers and speakers) seem to depend on a number of contextual factors when using metaphors in discourse. This article refers to a few context types, such as the immediate linguistic context, the knowledge of conceptualizers about themselves and the topic, the immediate cultural context, the social context, and the physical setting. One of the most frequently studied type of context in which metaphors appear is *linguistic context*, which, as summarised by Kövecses (this volume), is established on the ground of different conceptual frames (together with temporary mental spaces) and symbolic units (form-meaning pairs, and words), which represent and activate the frames. Metaphorically used expressions, that is the so-called metaphoric symbolic units, are embedded into this flow of frames and words, hence into the flow of discourse. In fact, metaphors can be evoked not only on the level of frames but they can be also realised on more individualised and less schematic levels, e.g., the level of domains and mental spaces (Kövecses, 2017b, p. 323; Kövecses, 2020, p. 52). What is of great importance is the researcher's observation, based on an informal collection of data from a variety of newspapers, that the already-mentioned contextual factors motivate, to a great extent, the use of many novel metaphors, which appear to have a unique status, since they are grounded in the context in which metaphorical conceptualization occurs. These contextual factors not only prime the use of particular metaphors but also "facilitate the development and mutual understanding of the discourse" (Kövecses, this volume).

Furthermore, the claim, rooted in the Saussurean view of meaning, that the same meaning or idea can be expressed through various forms, including lan-

guage, dance, music, or art (St. Clair, 2002, p. 2), is expertly supported by another contributor of this volume, Joanna Pędzisz, who makes an attempt to name the unspeakable, that is to verbalise the knowledge about movement qualities in contemporary dance, by means of Rudolf Laban's conceptual apparatus for movement analysis (Wojnicka 2010/2011). In her paper, Pędzisz notes that the specific knowledge of a dance instructor is expressed by means of their specialised and highly metaphorical language. The metaphoricity of the dance teacher's commands is expressed by the linguistic metaphors concerning the required components of movement (space, weight, time, flow). These metaphors are reliant on the skills, education and experience of dance participants. Dance learners take these metaphorical instructions of the teacher as an auditory and visual metaphorical stimulus (Frydrysiak, 2017, p. 172; Pędzisz, this volume). Importantly, this mutual relationship created between the two conceptualizers (a teacher and a learner) is what reconstructs the meaning of the instructions.

Viewing metaphor and metonymy as important conceptual mechanisms which motivate meaning construction and semantic change (cf. Traugott, 2012), Robert Kiełtyka, in his chapter, suggests that a lexical item may develop several metaphorical and metonymic senses over time. In his study, the researcher thoroughly investigates the semantics of the "top" ten English terms of Germanic, Romance and Arabic origin, i.e., trivia, hazard, muscle, avocado, handicap, fiasco, slapstick, bedlam, eavesdrop, and phon(e)y, in their figurative senses. Kiełtyka clarifies that most of the terms under scrutiny seem to have received a figurative reading as a result of activating the mechanism of metonymization between senses. Since the mental process of metonymization entails "the use of a lexical item to evoke the sense of something that is not conventionally linked to that particular item" (Paradis, 2011, p. 2), it is recognised as a powerful methodological tool to account for the semantic change of the investigated terms. In addition to their universal popularity, the words subject to analysis appear to be deeply entrenched and culture-bound, which makes them influential enough to exert a strong impact on social cognition (Kiełtyka, this volume).

The role of metonymy, viewed as one of the basic construals shaping and conditioning the use of language, is also recognised by Elżbieta Muskat-Tabakowska, who addresses the incident of the seizing of a tank from the Russian army by Ukrainian civilians, which occurred in the battle zone soon after the February 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine. Using the pragmatic aspects of the interactive (online) messages, the author of the chapter skilfully presents the evolution of Polish social response to this episode. By means of the mechanism of conceptual integration and her in-depth analysis of the inherently metonymic language expressions extracted from Internet websites, Muskat-Tabakowska effectively processes the extralinguistic contextual information to help us understand the hidden linguistic messages. Undeniably, to make communication between senders and

receivers of the message productive, and to shape Internet users' attitudes towards ethnic stereotypes, the Russian aggressors and political correctness, the conceptualizers need to share the worldview, embedded in a particular social and cultural context (Muskat-Tabakowska, this volume).

In the next chapter of this volume, Yakiv Bystrov, Olha Bilyk, Nataliia Ivanotchak, Iryna Malyshivska, and Nataliia Pyliachyk account for another incident that occurred in Ukraine, namely the Chornobyl disaster (Ukrainian spelling 'Chornobyl' is here purposefully used, instead of the Russian spelling 'Chernobyl'). Despite having been distorted in USSR and Post-Soviet media discourse and disconnected from the mainstream culture, the catastrophe incessantly occupies its multidimensional space within social cognition around the world (Zabuzhko, 2020). By investigating the multimodal metaphors in the five episodes of the miniseries "Chernobyl," the issue of Chornobyl can be actualised. In their identification and selection of the multimodal metaphors, the researchers make use of the Filmic Metaphor Identification Procedure. Multimodal metaphor, represented by various modes (i.e., visual, written, or auditory), is chosen to update the world's perception of the Chornobyl catastrophe. Indeed, thanks to the researchers' in-depth analysis of modes and received amalgamations (dynamic and vivid cinematic images, enhanced with sonic and verbal manifestations that construe the multimodal metaphors), the Chornobyl concept seems to be objectified and elaborated, which certainly will enrich the social cognition, by deepening the understanding of the Chornobyl tragedy, still featured with such strong emotions.

Another multi-part aspect of meaning construction can be brought into light through our understanding of what Fauconnier and Turner (2002) call *cognitive blends*. For Langacker (1987, p. 63), meaning resides in domains ("space", "colour"), which are constructed into mental spaces (Fauconnier, 1994), defined as small conceptual packets whose purpose entails local understanding and action. By overlapping, these spaces create new conceptualizations through the process of blending or conceptual integration (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002; Winters, 2015, pp. 157–158). This process is clearly referred to by a few contributors to this volume, e.g., Kardela et al. and Muskat-Tabakowska, introduced so far. The next chapter to refer to this mechanism is written by Aleksandra Majdzińska-Koczorowicz and Julia Ostanina-Olszewska, who relate to the 2022 Russian attack on Ukraine. In their study of some chosen pro-Ukrainian memes against the Russian invasion, Majdzińska-Koczorowicz and Ostanina-Olszewska discuss the cognitive mechanisms in terms of their bimodal construal, as delineated in the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), conceptual integration theory (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002), and the view of construal by Langacker (2008, 2019). Regarded as multimodal constructions that reveal "networked creativity and a mechanism of political participation" (Majdzińska-Koczorowicz

& Ostanina-Olszewska, this volume), memes are meant to generate new frames and meanings. This function of memes is motivated by the humorous and satirical nature of memes. The online meaning construction of memes results from frameshifting and convergence of different mental spaces. The researchers believe that, by means of blending and frame substitution, the humorous incongruity revealed in pro-Ukrainian memes will draw the world's attention to the Ukrainian issue and communicate their piercing cry for help.

Finally, the significance of multimodality, presented in a more usage-based model, is also recognised by Agnieszka Mierzwińska-Hajnos, who conducts a cognitive analysis of a TV commercial for *Momester®Nasal*, in which three modes (visual, linguistic and aural) coexist in varying degrees. The researcher distinguishes both the emphasised and concealed elements in the three disparate modes, proving successfully that this highlighting and hiding cognitive mechanism, "contributes to greater cross-resonance among the modes, which in turn reinforces the creative potential of the message" (Mierzwińska-Hajnos, this volume; cf. Pérez Sobrino, 2017). Indeed, the co-occurrence of multiple modes naturally forces some elements or/and modes to be highlighted and others to be hidden. This mechanism seems to refer to Leonard Talmy's (1975) figure-ground relation, Langacker's (1987) profile-landmark distinction, or Fauconnier and Turner's (2002) conceptual blending, the last of which dynamically projects the selected elements of the given input spaces to form a novel blended space with emergent structure (Fauconnier & Turner, 2003, p. 57). Finally, as noticed by the author of this paper, the plethora of available modes is not only a characteristic feature of human messages and communication but also a purposeful technique chosen by contemporary advertising companies and TV commercials (Forceville, 1996, p. 104; Forceville, 2008; Winiarska & Załazińska, 2018, p. 7; Mierzwińska-Hajnos, this volume).

4. Final remarks

As a final note, it is really crucial to emphasise the mutual interdependence and overlapping of the two cognitive approaches, i.e., Cognitive Grammar and the study of Cognitive Semantics, which may be occasionally separate in practice, but, in fact, their domains of enquiry are tightly linked.

This volume is to prove that both of the approaches in Cognitive Linguistics seem to correlate and overlap in several issues. Langacker's detailed analysis of the levels of reality derived from the descriptive dimensions of Cognitive Grammar and Kardela et al.'s elaborations on the "places of indeterminacy" in Mickiewicz's sonnet "The Ackerman Steppe" rely on the gestalt-based mechanism of grouping. The other papers in this volume (by Kövecses, Pędzisz, Kiełtyka, Muskat-Taba-kowska, Bystrov et al., Majdzińska-Koczorowicz & Ostanina-Olszewska, and by Mierzwińska-Hajnos) focus more specifically on semantically-driven meaning reconstruction, meaning shifts and meaning change. Specifically, the analyses

in these chapters stem from the well-known general cognitive mapping abilities, such as metaphor, metonymy and conceptual blending. The analyses aim to explain the ways in which linguistic expressions, gestures, sound, images or movement are used and extended to new contexts and new meanings.

As observed by the authors of this volume, the potential of conceptual metaphor and metonymy may be demonstrated at all levels of linguistic description, and their "important contribution to connecting mind with the body, language with culture, body with culture, and language with the brain" (Kövecses, 2017a, p. 215) certainly cannot be undervalued. Owing to Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Conceptual Blending Theory, complex networks of semantic connections, supporting the mental imagery, encoded in the elements and modes under scrutiny, and primed contextually, can be unveiled. Expectedly, all the cognitive theories applied in the research discussed in this volume may help us appreciate human vivid imagination and mental capacities, often "giving rise to surprising, unexpected, and fanciful associations between various entities and phenomena" (Kowalewski, 2022, p. 93).

Eventually, it is usage-based models, constructed within a cognitive approach to language and grammar, which recognises language investigation as "an instrument used in dynamically changing acts of interpersonal communication rather than as an abstract system of signs" (Muskat-Tabakowska, this volume).

Lastly, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to all the authors for their contributions to this volume. We would also like to thank those who reviewed the papers for their thorough study, great commitment and appreciated advice given to the authors, which was subsequently accomplished.

Lublin, March 2023

References

Bergen, B., & Chang, N. (2005). Embodied construction grammar in simulation based language understanding. In J. O. Östman, & M. Fried (Eds.), *Construction Grammars: Cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions* (pp. 147–190). Berlin, New York: John Benjamins.

Evans, V. (2012). Cognitive linguistics. Overview. *WIREs Cognitive Science, 3*, 129–141. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1163

Evans, V., Bergen, B. K., & Zinken, J. (2007). The cognitive linguistics enterprise: An overview. In V. Evans, B. K. Bergen, & J. Zinken (Eds.), *The Cognitive Linguistics Reader* (pp. 2–36). London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Fauconnier, G. (1994). *Mental spaces.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think. Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities.* New York: Basic Books.

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2003). Conceptual blending, form and meaning. *Recherches en Communication, 19*, 57–86. https://doi.org/10.14428/rec.v19i19.48413

Forceville, Ch. (1996). *Pictorial metaphor in advertising*. London, New York: Routledge.

Forceville, Ch. (2008). Pictorial and multimodal metaphor in commercials. In E. F. McQuarrie, & B. J. Phillips (Eds.), *Go figure! New directions in advertising Rhetoric* (pp. 178–204). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Frydrysiak, S. (2017). *Taniec w sprzężeniu nauk i technologii. Nowe perspektywy w badaniach tańca*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Oficyna.

Geeraerts, D. (2006). Introduction. A rough guide to Cognitive Linguistics. In D. Geeraerts (Ed.), *Cognitive linguistics: Basic readings* (pp. 1–29). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Goldberg, A. (1995). *Constructions. A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ingarden, R. (1973). *The cognition of the literary work of art* (R. A. Crowley & K. R. Olson, Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Ingarden, R. (1947/2000). *Szkice z filozofii literatury*. Kraków: Znak.

Kardela, H. (2020). The linguistic sign from inside-out. Remarks on the formalist-functionalist debate: Noam Chomsky, Ronald Langacker and Daniel Dor. *LaMiCuS 4*(4), 14–40. https://doi.org/10.32058/LAMICUS-2020-001

Kay, P., & Fillmore, C. J. (1999). Grammatical constructions and linguistic generalizations: The What's X doing Y? construction. *Language, 75*(1), 1–33. http://doi.org/10.2307/417472

Kowalewski, H. (2022). Three cognitive frameworks for analysing metaphoric plant names: Cognitive Grammar, Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Conceptual Blending Theory. *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury, 34*, 79–94. https://doi.org/10.17951/et.2022.34.79

Kövecses, Z. (2017a). Conceptual metaphor theory. In E. Semino, & Z. Demjén (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Metaphor* (pp. 13–27). London, New York: Routledge.

Kövecses, Z. (2017b). Levels of metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics*, *28*(2), 321–347. https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2016-0052

Kövecses, Z. (2020). *Extended conceptual metaphor theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108859127

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Langacker, R. W. (1976). Semantic representations and the relativity hypothesis. *Foundations of Language, 14*, 307–357.

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Vol. 1. Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1991). *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 2. Descriptive application.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (2019). *Cognitive linguistics – Foundations of language.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (2009). *Investigations in cognitive grammar*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Langacker, R. W. (2010). *Grammar and conceptualization.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Langacker, R. W. (2013). Modals: Striving for control. In J. I. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús-Hita, & J. van der Auwera (Eds.), *English modality: Core, periphery and evidentiality* (pp. 3–55). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Langacker, R. W. (2016). Baseline and elaboration. *Cognitive Linguistics, 27*, 405–439. https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2015-0126

Mickiewicz, A. (1917). The Ackerman Steppe (E. W. Underwood, Trans.). *Sonnets from the Crimea*. Retrieved February 10, 2022, from https://archive.org/details/sonnetsfromcrime00mick/page/n29/mode/2up

Paradis, C. (2011). Metonymization: A key mechanism in semantic change. In A. Barcelona, R. Benczes, & F. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (Eds.), *What is metonymy? An attempt at building a consensus view on the delimitation of the notion of metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 1–22). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.28.04par

Pérez Sobrino, P. (2017). *Multimodal metaphor and metonymy in advertising*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Saussure, F. de (1968). *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Saussure, F. de (1971). *Cours de linguistique Générale*. Paris: Payot.

Saussure, F. de (1915/1981). *Cours de linguistique Générale. Critical edition by Tullio de Mauro*. Paris: Payot.

St. Clair, R. N. (2002). Metaphorical blends, recruited frames and metaphors across cultures. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 11*(3), 1–24.

Stockwell, P. (2020). *Cognitive poetics. An introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Talmy, L. (1975). Figure and ground in complex sentences. *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 419–430. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Taylor, J. (2002). *Cognitive grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Traugott, E. C. (2012). Pragmatics and language change. In K. Allan, & K. Jaszczolt (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 549–565). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winiarska, J., & Załazińska, A. (2018). *Multimodalność komunikacji*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Winters, M. E. (2015). On the origins of cognitive grammar. In J. Daems, E. Zenner, K. Heylen, D. Speelman, & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *Change of paradigms – New paradoxes. Recontextualizing language and linguistics. Applications of cognitive linguistics 31* (pp. 149–168). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Wojnicka, I. (2010/2011). *Rudolf Laban i Analiza Ruchu*. Retrieved March 13, 2020, from https://www.academia.edu/36711432/RUDOLF_LABAN_I_ANALIZA_RUCH

Zabuzhko, O. (2020). *Planet Sagebrush. Selected essays*. Kyiv: Komora.